P957
S471

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

United Theological Seminary Library

MAR 15 1971

478-6028

Theological Implications of the Relation of the Church and Theological School in America — Jas. I. McCord

Archaeological Expedition to Israel, 1960 — Charles T. Fritsch

Hebrew, Greek—and All That — E. G. Homrighausen, E. M. Good, T. P. Lindsay, and B. M. Metzger

To the Ends of the Earth and the End of Time — J. Coventry Smith

An Almost Chosen People — Richard Luecke

Architectural Implications of Recent Trends in Reformed Liturgy — Conrad H. Massa

Review—Article: Communism and the Churches — Edward A. Dowey, Jr.

VOLUME LIV, NUMBER 3

FEBRUARY 1961

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Jas. I. McCord
President

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Peter K. Emmons, President — John M. Templeton, Vice-President
Frederick E. Christian, Secretary — George W. Loos, Jr., Treasurer
The Hanover Bank, New York, N.Y., Assistant Treasurer

Arthur M. Adams
Roland W. Anderson
Clem E. Bininger
Eugene Carson Blake
Charles Edward Brubaker
John G. Buchanan
Allan M. Frew
John T. Galloway
E. Harris Harbison
Albert J. Hettinger
Ralph Cooper Hutchison
Weir C. Ketler
Bryant M. Kirkland
Harry G. Kuch
Henry B. Kuizenga
Raymond I. Lindquist
John S. Linen
Edmund P. Lorenz
James K. Louden
Thomas M. MacMillan
John W. Meister
W. Beverly Murphy
Mrs. John J. Newberry
William H. Scheide
H. D. Moore Sherrerd
W. Sherman Skinner
George E. Sweazey
Mrs. Paul Switz
Samuel G. Warr
David B. Watermulder

TRUSTEES EMERITI

Richard J. Dearborn
Benjamin F. Farber
Henry Hird
Wm. Hallock Johnson
Albert J. McCartney
Mrs. Charles O. Miller

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

DONALD MACLEOD, *Editor* — EDWARD J. JURJI, *Book Review Editor*

The BULLETIN is published quarterly by the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the United Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey. Numbers 1, 2, and 3 of each volume are mailed free of charge to all alumni and on an exchange basis with various institutions. Number 4 in the series is the annual academic catalogue of the Seminary and may be obtained by request to the Office of the Registrar.

Entered as second class matter May 1, 1907, *at the post office at Princeton, N.J., under the Act of Congress of July* 16, 1894.

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

VOL. LIV FEBRUARY, 1961 Number 3

Donald Macleod, Editor Edward J. Jurji, Book Review Editor

THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH AND THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL IN AMERICA *Jas. I. McCord* 4

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXPEDITION TO ISRAEL, 1960 *Charles T. Fritsch* 12

HEBREW, GREEK—AND ALL THAT *E. G. Homrighausen, E. M. Good, T. P. Lindsay, B. M. Metzger* 18

TO THE ENDS OF THE EARTH AND THE END OF TIME *J. Coventry Smith* 34

AN ALMOST CHOSEN PEOPLE *Richard Luecke* 42

ARCHITECTURAL IMPLICATIONS OF RECENT TRENDS IN REFORMED LITURGY *Conrad H. Massa* 48

REVIEW—ARTICLE: COMMUNISM AND THE CHURCHES *Edward A. Dowey, Jr.* 57

BOOK REVIEWS:

The Book of Jeremiah, by Howard T. Kuist *Wesley J. Fuerst* 60
Dynamic Preaching, by James W. Clarke *John E. Gardner* 60
Index to Periodical Literature of the Apostle Paul, by Bruce M. Metzger *Paul Minear* 61
Word and Sacrament, A Preface to Preaching and Worship, by Donald Macleod *Wade P. Huie, Jr.* 62
Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman, by J. M. Meyers, J. Hempel, H. S. Gehman, E. E. Flack, C. T. Fritsch, *et al* *R. B. Y. Scott* 62
God, Man, and Satan, by Roland M. Frye *Otto A. Piper* 63
On the Authority of the Bible, by L. Hodgson, C. F. Evans, *et al* 64
Luther the Expositor, by Jaroslav Pelikan 65
Animal and Man in Bible Lands, by F. S. Bodenheimer *Howard T. Kuist* 65
The Bible Companion, by William Neil 66
A Dictionary of Life in Bible Times, by W. Corswant 67
A Protestant Speaks His Mind, by Ilion T. Jones *Norman V. Hope* 67
The Scottish Reformation, by Gordon Donaldson 68
An Introduction to the Science of Missions, by J. H. Bavinck *J. Christy Wilson* 69
One World One Mission, by W. Richey Hogg 70
Safe in Bondage, by Robert W. Spike 70
The Pastor's Prayerbook, by R. N. Rodenmayer *Donald Macleod* 71
How Can I Know God?, by W. E. Sangster 71
The Church on the Urban Frontier, by G. P. Musselman *Conrad H. Massa* 71
New Images of Man, by Peter Selz 72
Language and Religious Language, by Jules L. Moreau *Arlo D. Duba* 73

IN THIS ISSUE

THE opening article, "Theological Implications of the Relation of the Church and Theological School in America," by President McCord, was originally an address delivered at the twenty-second biennial meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools at Richmond, Va., June 14-17, 1960, and subsequently published in their Bulletin (No. 24).

During the summer of 1960, Professor Fritsch of the Biblical Department served as chief field archaeologist with the Link Marine Expedition to Caesarea. In his article, "Archaeological Expedition to Israel," Dr. Fritsch tells an interesting story of this first underwater expedition to the Holy Land.

In the current attempt to rethink and revise the curricula of theological seminaries, the problem of the place and handling of Hebrew and Greek, the original languages of Scripture, has come to the front again. The issue has been aggravated in the seminaries of the United Presbyterian Church by the fact that the General Assembly lays down certain educational requirements for ordination of ministerial candidates, the knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek languages being one of them. In a series of short articles, "Hebrew and Greek—and All That," four writers have set down their reflections. Dean Homrighausen of Princeton outlines the position of the General Assembly; Professor Edwin Good, of Stamford University, writes from the position of a teacher of Hebrew in a university; the Reverend Thomas P. Lindsay, Ph.D., states the case for the Biblical languages as a preaching minister in First Church, Haddonfield, N.J.; and Professor Metzger, both as a New Testament scholar and as a member of a special committee of the Council on Theological Education, presents an interesting collation of the results of a questionnaire mailed out to younger ministers.

During this academic year, the Students' Lectureship on Missions was given by Dr. John Coventry Smith, General Secretary of the Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations of the United Presbyterian Church. The third lecture in the series has been made available for publication in the BULLETIN and is entitled, "To The Ends of the Earth and The End of Time."

Other titles comprising the contents of this issue are: a sermon, "An Almost Chosen People," given in the Princeton University Chapel at the annual community Thanksgiving Service, November 24, 1960, by the Reverend Richard Luecke, Ph.D., pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Mes-

siah; a paper, "Architectural Implications in Recent Trends in Reformed Liturgy," by the Reverend Conrad H. Massa, Th.D., assistant professor of Homiletics. This paper was read at the Third Annual Conference of the Church Architectural Guild of America and the National Council of Churches Division of Church Building and Architecture which met in Princeton, September 21-23, 1960. In view of the timeliness of Ralph L. Roy's new book, *Communism and the Churches*, Professor Dowey of the Department of Theology has written a review-article in which he explores and evaluates the major emphases of this comprehensive volume.

D. M.

SPECIAL LECTURERS

April 17-21, 1961

L. P. Stone Lectureship
Ivan Engnell, Th.D.
Professor of Old Testament
University of Uppsala

Subject:
"Forms of Religion in Old Israel"

Annie Kinkead Warfield Lectureship
Jacques Courvoisier
Rector, University of Geneva

Subject:
"Zwingli, A Reformed Theologian"

THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RELATION OF THE CHURCH AND THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL IN AMERICA

JAS. I. McCORD

THE scope of this paper will be limited rather arbitrarily to the relation of church and theological school in the United States. This restriction is being imposed not because the Canadian pattern is not relevant, but because I am less familiar with its genesis and history. From my experience in St. Andrews College, Saskatoon, and in two theological colleges in Toronto, I have concluded that the theological school in Canada has remained closer to the university and that its curriculum contains a great deal more of the classic body of divinity than do the majority of our seminaries in the United States. The principal reason for this, I should suspect, is historical, and is to be found in the closer ties that exist with Great Britain. But much of what I shall have to say later on will lead one to ask if the Canadian educators and churchmen have not faced a problem similar to our own and have solved it without some of our excesses.

The American Revolution constituted a watershed for theological education, as well as for most of the other institutions in the New World, and by the end of the first decade of the nineteenth century the pattern that theological education was destined to take was becoming evident. Let me summarize some of the elements that were instrumental in this new development. Although young men were being educated for the ministry in the colonial period in the newly-established colleges and under "approved divines," many of the traditions that had been transplanted to the new world continued to have their ministers trained abroad. "It was a breaking off of the old world connections as a result of independence which created the first theological seminary in America," Dr. Sweet wrote, in his description of the founding of what is now the New Brunswick Theological Seminary by the Dutch Reformed Church.

Other elements were present and even more influential in effecting a change in the conception of theological education. If the majority of the Congregational and Presbyterian ministers had received a university education and had had this augmented by private instruction under established and experienced clergymen, this points to an underlying unity of knowledge in the embryonic universities and to the central role theology had in the curriculum that was the diet of all the students. Moreover, the establishment of chairs of divinity in Harvard, Yale, and Princeton in the eighteenth century furnishes further evidence of the integrative role of theology. But the intellectual climate was substantially different following the Revolution. A growing secularism extended across the universities and throughout the States. This movement, too, was produced by a combination of

forces, the deistic world view of the Enlightenment and pietism's narrowed sphere of interest. The influence of the Enlightenment on the founding fathers is common knowledge. Pietism's effect was, strangely enough, much the same, for both movements tended to conceive religion separately, as an entity unto itself, autonomous, and apart from the life of thought and action. The same half century witnessed the Great Awakening and the First Amendment, and the disestablishment of an order that had been inherited from the old world.

Professor George H. Williams, in an excursus entitled "Church, Commonwealth, and College," has traced the religious sources of these three institutions and their coordinate relationship. This was implicit in the academies of the Reformation no less than in the schools of the Middle Ages, and came to this country as a lively idea. Universities were founded to train young men for service in the Church and in the Commonwealth. Both institutions were ordained of God and were to serve as his ministers. Now, however, this relation was broken, suspicion arose over the orthodoxy of the university, and religion tended to lose its place in the center of human affairs.

The separation of the seminaries from the universities was the result. One remembers the circumstances surrounding the founding of Andover. The correspondence of one of Princeton Seminary's first professors reveals a similar fear. In the first decade of the nineteenth century Samuel Miller wrote to Ashbel Green, "Nothing can be done at Princeton at present and perhaps not for ten years. I doubt whether a divinity school there . . . could be made, in the present state of the college, to command the confidence of the Presbyterian church . . . I fear the theological students would not be the better for habitual intercourse with the students in the arts." Considering the doctrinal questions that would arise "none but ministers and elders of our church," and not the trustees of the college, must govern. "In short, if it be desired to have the divinity school uncontaminated by the college, to have its government unfettered and its orthodoxy and purity perpetual," establishment of a completely independent seminary was deemed necessary.[1]

Let me add one other factor that was influential in the radical shift that took place and that helped produce the pattern of theological education as we have come to observe it. I refer to the opening of the frontier. The date of this is difficult to set, for if one means by frontier not a mere boundary but something to enter into, possess, and exploit, then we can date it from the earliest days of discovery and exploration. But the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 is a handy date for the vast migration that did not halt until it reached the Pacific Coast. Frederick Jackson Turner's "Frontier" thesis has been revived in our time, especially by Walter Prescott Webb in his volume *The Great Frontier*. Turner's thesis is well-known: "Up to our own day American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the great West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development." While this motif has been alternately used and criticized, and while there can be no doubt but that

[1] Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *Princeton 1746-1896*, p. 148.

the values and institutions that a frontier culture produced are increasingly irrelevant to an age in which frontier conditions no longer exist, still American Protestantism cannot be understood without taking into account the influence of the frontier on its development. The "denomination" itself is a product of the frontier, with the ensuing competition among denominations that has led to the overchurching of America. Moreover, the opening frontier necessitated the establishment of theological schools that would furnish a ministry to those who had left the East and were streaming across the mountains to new lands and to new homes. Revivalism was another frontier phenomenon, and many of the ministers were trained to participate in this movement to claim the new settlers for one or another of the competing denominations.

The description of this movement and of the founding of theological schools is the historian's task. It is for us to look at the ways in which these new institutions that were established on the frontier performed the tasks for which seminaries are designed. In a sense this will reflect our common history and will account for much of our present practice. Moreover, such an examination must be made in full cognizance of the changed conditions that exist today. For the frontier situation that produced so many of our patterns, including education's, no longer obtains. The mobility of church members across denominational lines is not to be equated with it, nor is the flight to suburbia. Hence it will be my contention that the challenge of this changed situation requires a response in theological education that is vastly different from the traditional one. It should mean that instead of tampering with theological education, we look at it with fresh eyes and a will to embrace radical alterations. To put it differently, we should take as our first task theological education and the rigorous discipline that this will require, not only for theological students, but also for all those interested in the Christian faith.

While it is true that the theological school, like the Church, is centered in its chapel and in worship and is vitally interested in Christian nurture, I shall take this prior concern for granted, not because it is unimportant but because it is too important to argue. A seminary is a community where both junior and senior members are disciplined by the Word of God. The concern for love to God and love to man is first. However, there are specific assignments given by the Church to the theological school, and these include the training of the Church's leadership and the performing of the Church's theological task. Of course, neither of these belongs exclusively to the seminary, and when the seminaries perform their tasks well, then the entire Church will be involved deeply in these two programs.

I

If one looks first at the training of the Church's leadership as a responsibility of the theological school, then certain basic objectives should characterize the program of theological education. The first is undoubtedly the acquisition of a broad theological culture. This had been no problem when theological education was an integral part of university education, for theology informed the culture which the university both epitomized and transmitted. Certainly it was no problem in the best theological education in the old world, where his-

tory, including the history of ideas, was taken with much seriousness and where the past was part of the living present in the traditions of the universities and of the peoples. But the founding of the American republic represented something different with regard to history. In a sense it was a break with history. It was the establishment of a new experiment in a new world, along with the conscious attempt to turn one's back on all of the complications and ambiguities that had been produced by the history of the previous centuries. For this reason, theological education in the United States has generally been less than successful in its attempt to make available to the student a broad theological culture.

Let me illustrate this by citing the plight of church history in many curricula that have been typical. For one thing, each tradition, cut off from the whole, tended to absolutize its own experience, and church history became the curricular vehicle through which denominationalism was perpetuated. I think a case can be made for the position that in history even more than in theology this narrow view prevailed. In addition, each tradition tended to move from its own starting point directly to the New Testament, thus bypassing centuries of the Church's life and thought. It is for this reason that American Protestantism has yet to capture the horizontal dimension of catholicity. If religion is considered separate and apart, then two other consequences follow. One is that the history of the Church is separated from the discipline of history as such and must be re-taught even to the student whose university major is in the same field. The second is that history ceases to include religion as a significant factor in human culture and as influential in the destinies of men and nations.

This is only one example of how theological education has been impoverished by limitations that have hindered the seminaries in exposing its students to the fullest theological culture. It has been easier to become training institutes in practical affairs, in arts and skills, with a historical and theological background that is truncated and selected.

The second objective in training the Church's leadership is to enable the student to think theologically. This, of course, implies that theology is central to human life and that all the minister thinks and does is to be seen in the light of his own theological commitment. Here it is that the seminary has an opportunity to restore something of the wholeness that was lost when the rising tide of secularism destroyed the last remnants of a synthesis of faith and life. In this area the seminary has an opportunity to think through its task, to achieve some sort of theological unity, to overcome fragmentation, and to aid the minister to view his varied activities in the light of a common purpose. But again the traditional school in America, while taking into account the priority of personal faith, has failed to think through its own educational task theologically and to make the connection in the mind of the student that will enable him to relate his faith to the whole of his experience. For this reason we have been singularly unsuccessful in producing any movement in society that restores religious faith to its proper place in the world of affairs. We have found it easier for the Church to take on the image of the world and to conduct her

business after this pattern than to order her own life according to her own commitment and to make her theology relevant in the lives and affairs of her members.

The third objective in the training of the Church's leadership is to enable the student to engage in the theological enterprise not only in his seminary days but throughout his life. This means that theology is not a given, as the Gospel is a given, but that it is an activity in which one participates. The peculiar subject matter of Christian theology is God, as He has revealed Himself and as He continues to work in the world. The theological enterprise involves, then, both God and the world. Too often theological education is conceived in terms of a body of knowledge that is known by the professor and that can be taken down in a notebook and learned by the student. Thus in three years of scribbling and memorizing the student can secure all of the answers to all of the questions and carry with him into the world his theology. But the theological student and the minister, like every Christian, are called to live responsibly in the light of the Word-made-flesh and must relate themselves and their faith to the common culture which they share with all men and in which God's own revelation has taken place. In other language we might say that the theological enterprise is the Church reflecting on the meaning of her message in the light of the situation in which she is put to perform her ministry. A program of study, therefore, should enable the student to be aware of this situation and to be willing to think through again and again the implications of the Church's message for the life that surrounds him and of which he himself is a part. The price of failure in this regard is irrelevance, and many of our graduates have been forced to learn all over again after they have begun their ministries in order to have a relevant word for their people.

The last objective that I shall cite is the acquisition of certain professional competencies. All along I have assumed that the seminary is the servant of the Church. That she has a prophetic role to perform is equally true, since she is also the servant of the Head of the Church. But her prophetic witness can be performed only from within. Church-relatedness has been the strength of seminaries in the American mode. The ministries that we perform are performed within the Church. However, it does not follow that the seminary in order to be servant must be simply pragmatic or functional. In the area of professional competence the theological school has performed perhaps her best service to the Church. Because many of the seminaries were established by the Church, often by local geographical bodies, their greatest strength came from their Church relation and they have been able to contribute a practical program for men actively engaged in the Church's day-to-day mission. Field work in the non-technical sense has not been a problem. It is no secret that departments of practical theology have flourished in this country as in no other in the Christian world. But each practical discipline has tended to be autonomous and divorced from the body of divinity traditionally conceived. It has not always been the fault of the practical departments. The older disciplines have not furnished foundations, and each new development in the practical field has chosen to develop or has been forced

to develop its own theology and its own foundation. The result is that even in the area in which we have professed the greatest strength we have often shown the greatest confusion.

II

When we turn to the second function for which the theological school is established, we see in much broader perspective the Church's theological task. The seminary is the institution that is designed to be the intellectual center of the Church. This responsibility cannot be separated or should not be separated from the first, that of the education of ministers. Active, creative, productive scholars will be the best teachers. But until recent years theological faculties have been generally understaffed, with faculty members working long hours, carrying inhumane teaching loads, and often engaged in some regular ecclesiastical responsibility. When one combines a suspicion about theology's relevance on the part of churches that are oriented in other directions with theological faculties that are unequipped to carry on systematic research, there is little wonder that the specifically theological task has not been performed adequately by any communion in America. There have been and are great scholars in all of the disciplines, and my generalization is certainly not meant to denigrate them. Moreover, some faculties have been more sucessful than others in prosecuting this theological task. Still the fact remains that much of our theology is imported and many of our churches are theologically illiterate.

This becomes apparent when we take into account two facts. The first is the vast revolution that took place in the world of thought in the nineteenth century, and the second is the clear superiority of German theological faculties to our own during that century and also during the first decades of the twentieth. Hugh Ross Mackintosh apologized in his *Types of Modern Theology* for including only continentals among the theologians he discussed. He went on to point out certain reasons for this. Among them were German thoroughness, the swiftness of movement of ideas on the continental scene, and the freedom of theological faculties from ecclesiastical control. In Germany professors were able with complete candor to deal with many of the new issues that had been posed by the developing sciences of the nineteenth century.

Let me cite certain examples of what this means. The first has to do with the doctrine of man. The question, "What is man?" is as old as the psalmist. It has been answered in a multiplicity of ways in the centuries since, but it must be answered in a radically new way in the light of what has happened in the last century. Actually, the Reformers could not ask, "What is man?" They did not have the tools and background to raise this question. They could only ask, "What is man as sinner?" But the nineteenth century produced a revolution in biology with Darwin and his discoveries, to be followed by a revolution in the social sciences and in psychology. The theologian now must raise the question, "What is man?" in the light of all these new dimensions, not to mention such other realms as are represented by the arts. What I am suggesting is that the pattern of theological education that developed in a frontier environment has not yet been successful in meeting the Church's theological need and that the seminaries have not

yet become the intellectual center of the Church that can influence the surrounding culture.

A second example could be given by raising the question, "Who is Jesus Christ?" Again, the nineteenth century was the great Christological century, equal perhaps in importance to the fourth and fifth centuries in this area of theology. It is well-known that the Reformers accepted the Christological formulations of the early ecumenical councils and that the Christological discussion of the Reformation period, especially between the Lutherans and Reformed, revolved around the limited question of the nature of the Risen Christ. But with the coming of the nineteenth century there were new factors unknown to the Chalcedonians. One was the new critical philosophy of Kant, with its emphasis on the subjective limitations of human knowledge. Another was the replacement of the old ontological categories with psychological categories, while a third was a new understanding and mastery of historical tools. Basically, therefore, the Christological question remains undealt with in our own time in the terms that are now available to us.

These are only two examples from among many that bear evidence of our lagging behind in our theological task. Is this perhaps traceable to the pattern of our theological schools that began to develop early in the history of the nation? If religion is divorced from life, the God of redemption from the God of creation, and the sacred democratic tenet, the separation of Church and State, is interpreted to mean the separation of our faith from the whole of human affairs, then there is small wonder that our theology has been a borrowed scholasticism or has been psychologized away and that there has been a general disengagement from the burning questions posed by the world. It was this disengagement that led to the social gospel movement, just as the lack of theological norms in this movement led to the fundamentalist reaction. It is unfortunate that just when there appeared to be some chance of a breakthrough, when progress could be made beyond the untenable positions of both parties to the strife, theology moved into a parenthesis. This parenthesis, although it often bears the name of a theological renascence, was produced by the National Socialist Movement in Germany, with its subtle attempt to claim the Church for its own ideology. Emil Brunner has pointed out how theologians immediately disengaged themselves from the questions with which they had been wrestling and rushed to the defense of the Church's authority and message. Now for nearly thirty years theology has had a sort of Barmen stance, and the second great task of the theological school remains to be done.

If I have sounded negative, it is not because I am pessimistic about the future of theological education in America. On the contrary, there is much evidence that all the things about which I have been speaking and others of equal significance are engaging the attention of an increasing number of theological faculties. My intention has been to point up the educational task that lies before us. One of my colleagues has recently claimed that the magnitude of this task is the greatest that the Church has known since her first three centuries, when she undertook the Christian education of the Graeco-Roman world. Now, as then, Christian education must

be apologetic, i.e., it must engage the world where it is with its problems and its questions and deal relevantly with them in the light of the living Gospel of Jesus Christ.

In conclusion, when one thinks of the relation of the Church and theological schools in America, four patterns seem to emerge. The first is the Bible school, which is avowedly a-historical and which makes little attempt to separate its own presuppositions and cultural conditioning from a "fresh" reading of the first century record. The second is denominational, which has the great strength of being-church-related but which at the same time has the possible weakness of being dominated by non-theological forces and of becoming disengaged from the world of culture. The third is non-denominational, which in most cases is an outgrowth of a denominational school that has purchased its freedom. Its strength has been its ability to broaden denominational lines that originally were restraining and its possible weakness a certain remoteness from the ongoing institutional life of the Church. The fourth is the inter-denominational, represented in the United States by the Federated Faculties of the University of Chicago and in Canada by the McGill University Faculty of Divinity. But this, too, is an American phenomenon, and is limited by the co-operative Christianity that has been our peculiar adjustment to the ecumenical imperative.

In spite of all the apparent differences, it may well be true that theological education in America has more of one pattern than we have been wont to admit and that we all share to a large extent the same strengths and the same weaknesses. Indeed, the weakness of the American seminary is closely related to its strength. Inheriting the legitimate role of servant to the Church, the seminaries have tended to champion particular histories and systems at the expense of breadth and growth and have not yet succeeded in exposing the churches to the rich and diversified heritage of the Church.

If this is true, then it is time for us as members of an American Association of Theological Schools to articulate again the rationale for a learned ministry, to recognize that for most of us this is the principal reason for our profession as a profession, and to take seriously the fact that only a committed and learned ministry has any chance of influencing, indeed of transforming and redeeming, the culture around us. Surely this is mandate enough for us to get on with our educational and theological tasks in this generation with renewed dedication and renewed vigor.

ARCHEOLOGICAL EXPEDITION TO ISRAEL, 1960[1]

AMERICAN-ISRAEL SOCIETY: PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: LINK MARINE EXPEDITION

Charles T. Fritsch

After a twenty-nine day sea voyage from San Juan, Puerto Rico, the Link Marine Expedition arrived at Caesarea, Israel, on June 15, 1960, aboard the Sea Diver, a ninety-one foot, one hundred and sixty-eight ton vessel, built from the keel up especially for underwater archeology. Mr. Edwin A. Link, inventor and business executive, who designed and personally supervised the construction of Sea Diver, was the director of the expedition. Members of his staff included Mrs. Marion Clayton Link, writer and researcher, Mr. George L. Cassidy, Executive Director of the America-Israel Society, Charles T. Fritsch, Professor of Old Testament, Princeton Theological Seminary, chief field archeologist, and Immanuel Ben Dor, Professor of Biblical Archeology, Candler School of Theology, Emory University, archeological consultant. There were also three crew members and five volunteer divers, one of whom was Lt. Com. Charles A. Aquadro, M.D., USN, a specialist in underwater medicine.

This first underwater expedition to the Holy Land was sponsored by the America-Israel Society and Princeton Theological Seminary. Financial aid was also given by *Life* magazine, several foundations, and generous individuals. The purpose of the expedition was to explore the harbor area of Caesarea Maritima in Israel, as well as the waters of the Sea of Galilee. For these two projects a license was issued by the Department of Antiquities of Israel which cooperated in every way to make the expedition a success.

Underwater archeology is a comparatively new science. Begun after World War II, its rapid progress was made possible by the pioneering work of men like Captain Cousteau, and the development of efficient diving equipment and underwater photography techniques. Skin diving with the aqualung has made it possible for the diver to search visually over wide areas of the sea floor by freeing him from the old-fashioned, cumbersome diving suit and the oxygen life line which hampered his freedom of movement. In addition, underwater detection instruments of a highly technical nature have been developed to supplement the visual search of the diver. The Sea Diver is equipped with a number of these devices, some of which were invented by Mr. Link. The fathometer is an electronic device which records by needle on graph paper the contour of the floor of the sea. In this

[1] For a detailed description of the Sea Diver and the preparations for the expedition see author's article in *PTS Bulletin* LIII (Oct. 1959), pp. 25-29.

way wrecks of ships and other large objects may be detected. The magnetometer detects the presence of metal objects under the water. The airlift is a kind of vacuum cleaner which sucks up mud and sand from the floor bottom through aluminum tubing and spews it out upon a barge where the search for smaller artifacts like coins, gems, or seals may be more easily carried on. And then there is the powerful jet hose which may be used to clear away the mud and sand from a certain area where the divers may wish to make a more intensive search. Mr. Link has even invented an underwater television device which will be of inestimable value to the marine archeologist. The Sea Diver itself is equipped with jet propulsion which makes it possible to maneuver the ship in any direction within a very small area.

I

The harbor of Caesarea, situated along the coast of Israel about twenty miles south of Haifa, was the first object of our search. The fishermen, working out of this harbor and others along the coast, have been finding numerous amphorae and household pottery ware dating from as early as the second millennium B.C. down to Roman and Byzantine times. We know that Egyptian ships were sailing along this coast line as early as 3000 B.C., stopping off each night along the way from Egypt to Byblos and return. Sudden storms were a constant danger to these frail vessels. Sometimes the sailors would throw their wares overboard to lighten the ship; many times, no doubt, the ships sank with their cargo. Such a "mighty tempest on the sea" is described in the Book of Jonah. In this story the sailors "threw their wares that were in the ship into the sea, to lighten it for them" (Jon.1:5). Another famous storm on the Mediterranean is described in Acts 27 where we are told that Paul was shipwrecked by a typhonic nor'easter, or Euroclydon (Acts 27:14). A recent study shows that there are three hundred and forty-four amphorae and other artifacts in the museums of Israel today which have been taken from the sea. Most of this material was found within a five mile limit from the shore at depths of from sixty to two hundred feet. This is just a small part of the sunken treasures which lie along the coast line of the eastern Mediterranean Sea.

One of the more important landmarks for ancient mariners along these coastal waters was a pile of rocks jutting out into the sea, called Strato's Tower. Here it was that Herod the Great decided to build a magnificent city, which he called Caesarea, in honor of the Roman Emperor, Caesar Augustus, and a great harbor which would be worthy of his kingdom. A detailed account of the construction of Caesarea and its harbor is given by the Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus, in his two works, *Jewish Antiquities* and *The Jewish War*. Built within a period of twelve years and dedicated about 10 B.C., Caesarea soon became one of the most important cities in Palestine. As the Roman capital of Palestine it was the residence of the Roman procurators. From here Pontius Pilate left for the trial of Jesus in Jerusalem. Here the first Gentile was converted to Christianity (Acts 10). Paul was imprisoned at Caesarea for two years (Acts 24:27), and from here he sailed for Rome on his last journey (Acts 27). Caesarea was

the base of operations for the Roman armies against the Jews in the two Jewish revolts of A.D. 66-70 and 132-135. Origen, the greatest Biblical scholar of the early church, lived and taught here in the later years of his life, and Eusebius, the father of church history, was bishop of Caesarea from A.D. 313-340. The Moslems captured the city in the seventh century, A.D., and the Crusaders, whose massive walled city is now being excavated, occupied the site for almost two centuries (c. A.D. 1100-1265). Caesarea was destroyed by the Moslems when recaptured from the Crusaders, and it has lain in ruins ever since. During World War II a Jewish Kibbutz, known as Sedoth Yam (Fields of the Sea), was established a short distance south of the city walls. It was at this spot that many Jewish refugees from Europe were smuggled illegally into Palestine, a story which has been dramatically retold in the modern novel, *Exodus*, by Leon Uris.

The harbor of Caesarea, as described by Josephus, was a magnificent structure. The huge sea wall was built by lowering enormous blocks of limestone into twenty fathoms of water. On top of the wall, which was two hundred feet wide, were towers, arches and a promenade which encircled the whole harbor. "At the mouth of the haven [which faced the north] were on each side three great colossi, supported by pillars, where those colossi that are on your left hand as you sail into the port, are supported by a solid tower; but those on the right hand are supported by two upright stones joined together, which stones were larger than that tower which was on the other side of the entrance" (*War*, I, 21, 7).

In exploring the harbor of Caesarea this summer the Link expedition discovered a number of significant things. It is quite clear now from the presence of numerous pillars, walls and foundation works submerged in the water just off shore that the harbor shore line has sunk a number of feet during the last two thousand years. This has also been confirmed recently by geological surveys of the Israeli coast line made by the Israeli government. This means that the foundations of the magnificent buildings along the landward side of the harbor are now lying underwater probably as far out as fifty feet from the present shore line. Although it is not certain what caused this falling away of the coast line, one may well surmise that it was due to some severe earthquake activity in the first centuries of the Christian era.

The circular breakwater which enclosed the harbor has been definitely established by the divers, although not scientifically plotted, and the entrance to the harbor on the northern side has been located. It was here that most of the diving and excavating took place during the summer's campaign. By using the airlift and jet hose it was definitely established that the remains of Herod's harbor lie fifteen feet below the present floor of the harbor. It was only after digging fifteen feet below the floor bottom that definite traces of the colossi which Josephus mentions were found. The divers noted not only large pieces of sculptured objects covered with a thick layer of marine plant life, but also a number of bases to which the large statuary works were attached. These latter objects are large flat cementlike blocks with rectangular holes lined with lead. The spacing

of these holes in the slabs would seem to indicate that they were the places where the feet of the statues were attached to the bases on which they stood.

Also of significance was the discovery of a wooden beam, a foot square, lying underneath huge blocks of masonry. This would indicate a structural collapse of some kind, probably caused by an earthquake which sent the harbor installations hurtling into the water. A number of severe earthquakes have been recorded in this area in the first six centuries of the Christian era. Further excavations of the harbor may enable us to ascertain with accuracy the date of the catastrophe which destroyed the harbor of Caesarea.

Perhaps one of the most important objects discovered this summer was a commemorative medal or coin, about the size of a five-cent piece with two holes in it. On the obverse side a wall is represented with an opening in the middle, flanked by two towers. If this is a reproduction of the entrance to the harbor of Caesarea, it would be the first of its kind ever discovered. The letters KA on the obverse side may very well be an abbreviation of the word Caesarea. But the object must be thoroughly cleaned and studied before final conclusions are reached. A kind of seal which may have been part of a ring was also retrieved from under the water. Also a cache of lamps, a perfectly preserved amphora and many sherds of all kinds of pottery ware. Along the shore, just south of the harbor and behind what is popularly known as Cleopatra's bath, a large, colorful mosaic floor was discovered under the sand which was washed away with the jet hose.

The underwater archeological investigations of the harbor area of Caesarea have just begun. As it appears now, the rest of the work will be a major excavation job. It is hoped that Mr. Link will return to Caesarea in the near future to accomplish the task he has so auspiciously begun.

II

According to plan, the expedition also worked in the Sea of Galilee for a period of six weeks this summer. Reef Diver, a smaller version of Sea Diver, was transported from Haifa to Tiberias on the platform of a huge trailer-truck. Equipped with the most modern technical devices for underwater work, described above, this jet-stream propelled craft was used in the Galilee operation to explore the condition of the lake floor and to detect material remains there from the past.

The Sea of Galilee is about twelve miles long and seven miles across at its widest point. It lies about seven hundred feet below sea level which accounts for the daily summer temperature of a hundred degrees or more. In ancient times the lake was the main means of communication in this part of the land, as we can see, for instance, in the Gospel records of Jesus' Galilean ministry.

After a thorough study of the sites along the lake shore, and after many conversations with the local fishermen, it was decided to concentrate on four major areas: Capernaum, which was the center of Jesus' Galilean ministry; Magdala, the traditional home of Mary Magdalene and site of the sea battle between the Romans and the Jews described by Josephus; old Tiberias, the capital of Galilee built by Herod Antipas; and Beit Yeraḥ, an ancient tell or mound at the southern end of the

lake which has partially slipped into the lake.

Visual reconnaissance by the divers and fathometer soundings at these sites revealed that generally the floor of the lake is covered by a thick deposit of mud except near the shore line where it becomes quite rocky. Undersurface visibility is very poor, which made photography at floor level almost impossible. The divers worked most of the time at depths of thirty-five to forty feet where the artifacts to be described were found.

It was the good fortune of the expedition to find a large cache of Roman pottery sixty yards off shore in about thirty-five feet of water, half way between Tiberias and the Hart House, which is a branch of the Jerusalem YMCA. The artifacts were lying in thick mud, which preserved them for two millennia at the bottom of the lake. Seven perfect specimens of so-called Roman "cooking pots" from the first century A.D. were brought up from this spot, as well as twenty-two others of similar type which have been restored. Several pieces of this ware have been given to Princeton Theological Seminary where they are on exhibition. The form of these pots is well-known from land excavations of this period. They are round bodied, with short, upright, slightly everted neck, and two small loop handles from rim to shoulder. They are identical as far as the quality of pottery is concerned, which is a thin metallic reddish tan ware, very well fired with fine parallel ribbing which is typically Roman. Most of the pots discovered were of two general sizes. The larger ones measured a little over seven inches high and about ten inches at the girth; the smaller ones were six inches high and a little over eight inches at the girth. In addition to this predominant type a small juglet, about four inches high and perfectly preserved, was found. It has one handle, a high neck and a disk base. Also fragments of four flat bottom dishes, typical examples of the black common ware of the Roman period.

Together with the pottery were two stone anchors, such as were used by primitive seafarers in all periods. These may well be Roman anchors since they were found in the proximity of the pottery. Many more sherds from this site of the same type as the cooking pots would seem to indicate that there was a large number of artifacts at this particular spot. Since the pottery shows no signs of being used, it is surmised that it was being transported by ship across the lake. The fact that a homogeneous group of pottery was found in a single deposit together with two anchors makes it plausible that we have discovered a shipwreck with its cargo of ceramic wares at the bottom of the Sea of Galilee. After using the airlift several days on the area, nothing was found of the ship itself. The wood must have disintegrated during the two thousand years in the water, leaving the imperishable pottery and stone anchors as the only remaining evidence of the disaster. The ship may have foundered in one of the sudden storms which sweep down so frequently from the surrounding hills and turn the placid lake into a boiling cauldron within a few minutes.

Besides this cache of pottery the divers discovered artifacts in other areas of the lake which they searched visually. Several Herodian and Byzantine lamps, a two-handled black juglet about

five inches high with ribbed base, and numerous sherds from various types of pottery ware were retrieved from the muddy bottom of the lake. Also a curious tapered bar of iron about twelve inches long with a thick ferrous oxide incrustation was discovered in the Magdala area. Definite identification of this object awaits cleaning and scientific analysis of the metal, but it appears to be an implement of war which may have belonged to some Roman warrior who fought at the battle of Tarichaea, described by Josephus.

The Sea of Galilee is a large body of water and no doubt holds many ancient treasures in its mud-covered floor. It is hoped that further explorations will be carried on by Mr. Link in this historical area for the sake of all of us who are interested in the Bible lands and their history.

PRAYER

(Prayer given at Faculty Retreat, September 20, by Professor John E. Smylie.)

O Lord God, turn not Thy face from us. Thou knowest our need of Thee. Without Thee we cannot live or move or have being. We plead for Thy presence with us.

Be with us in judgment and in mercy to chasten and rebuke, to comfort and forgive.

Lay bare the impurity of our hearts: our fear and jealousy which leads us to believe the worst gossip about each other, to rejoice in the weakness of neighbours, and to deny brothers simple human encouragement; our narrow-mindedness and immaturity in calling our own the only legitimate broad-mindedness and sophistication; our folly in identifying private ambition with common good, and in judging others as if we were Thine only true servants; our sophistry in claiming personal credit for institutional success while renouncing blame for failure under the plea, "It was not my responsibility." Hide not Thy judgment from us, O God.

But in Thy mercy free us from guilt of these and past sins. We remember with contrition and seek forgiveness for our cowardice in formulating and implementing creative institutional policies, our irresponsibility in making hard decisions in face of unpleasant facts, our boredom with the truth and the students we teach, our indifference to injustice and need around us.

Be with us also in *power* and in *hope.*

Preserve us from fatigue and impotence. Let not the vastness and complexity of the work, or the indifference and scorn of the world create a sense of futility. Rather give us crusader hearts that mere talk may give way to action which breaks paralysis of custom and fear. Let not division of will sap our energies by leading to the pursuit of easy and inconsequential goals. Rather strengthen our wills that with purity of purpose we may dare great works for Thy kingdom. Let not the isolation of scholarship weigh down with loneliness and frustration. But give perseverance and insight to use learning as heroic warriors in the storm centers of life. Let not repetition make us indifferent teachers of stale truth. Hide not Thy power from us, O God, that we may be fresh and joyful as we daily receive Thy grace—ever new and always fresh.

Fill us with hope. Give the grace of divine optimism. Show us the goodness of the Lord in this land of the living, lest we become faint with cynicism. Buoy us up with such a sense of Thy rule in history that, with contagious joy, we may encourage each other, inspire our students, lead the Church, and prophesy to the nation. Grant us trust that we may dream dreams for our students, loved ones and children, as we commend them and ourselves to the protection of Thine everlasting arms.

We pray in the name of Him through whom Thou dost continually come to us in judgment and in mercy, in power, and in hope, even Jesus, the Christ. Amen.

HEBREW, GREEK–AND ALL THAT

I

ORDINATION, THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION AND THE BIBLICAL LANGUAGES

E. G. Homrighausen

The Constitution of the United Presbyterian Church is quite clear in its regulations regarding, 1. the care and oversight of candidates for the Gospel ministry and 2. the ordination of persons into the office of the ministry.

In these regulations there are specific references to the educational requirements for the ordained ministry which candidates are required to meet.

A

In the case of candidates under care of Presbytery, the Constitution states that while the student "remains subject to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the session of the Church to which he belongs," that as respecting "his preparatory training for the ministry he is under the oversight of the Presbytery." Presbytery is required to guide the candidate in his collegiate and seminary studies. In no case may a candidate omit from his course of study any of the subjects prescribed in the Form of Government as tests for ordination without obtaining the consent of the Presbytery by a three-fourths vote of the members present. And where that consent is given, the Presbytery shall record the fact and the reasons for such action.

B

The prescribed subjects upon which the candidate will later be examined for the ministry are:

Personal Christian religious experience and knowledge of the Bible
Philosophy
Ecclesiastical history
Greek and Hebrew languages
The Sacraments
Church government and discipline
Structure, organization, and official programs and promotional policies of the General Assembly
The Candidate's understanding of the import of the nine questions to be asked him at his ordination.

In addition to these parts of trial, the candidate shall present, 1. a short thesis in some theological subject, 2. an exposition of several verses of Scripture, and 3. a sermon in manuscript form, which the Presbytery may require him to preach before it.

In short, candidates for the ministry *must* prepare themselves for an examination in the Biblical languages. To do this, they ought to attend seminaries that teach these languages. The only alternative is to receive the permission of their Presbyteries, by a three-fourths

vote of those present, to pursue theological education without one or both Biblical languages in anticipation of ordination.

It is evident that a number of Presbyteries are granting permission to candidates to receive theological education —and subsequent ordination—without this specific requirement, thus waiving the regulation which requires the Biblical languages. This really means that Presbyteries are approving a theological education for ordination which definitely sets aside one part of the accepted standard of the Church. How long can the Church go on permitting candidates to omit subjects from their training which are required by the Form of Government?

C

The same situation obtains in the practice of ordaining persons who present themselves for ordination. However, in this case, Presbytery has the right to ordain persons without the prescribed education, after Synod consultation and collaboration, and through a three-fourths vote of the members of Presbytery present. This is a good rule by which persons without the required education but with the necessary qualifications may not be barred from the ministry.

From time to time, persons present themselves to Presbyteries who may be deficient in one or more of the subjects required for ordination. In these cases, Presbyteries may waive the rule regarding Biblical languages by a three-fourths vote. Such a decision, however, should be the exception and not the rule.

Presbyteries alone ordain persons into the Christian ministry. The Form of Government allows a measure of freedom for the exceptional cases. However, the increasing waiving of the rule regarding Biblical languages has reached a point where General Assembly will have to do one of two things: 1. uphold the rule more vigorously, or 2. revise or abolish it. Can we go on giving lip service to the rule that ordination requires an education and examination in the Biblical languages, when persons are being ordained in large numbers without this requirement by a waiving of the rule, and when Presbyteries are permitting candidates to secure their theological education without pursuing studies in Greek and Hebrew?

D

This matter has to do with the standards for the ministry in the United Presbyterian Church. The ministry is a matter of serious theological discussion in our time. What constitutes a learned ministry? How must the ministry of the United Presbyterian Church be educated today? Must an adequate ministry be able to read and interpret the Bible in the light of the original Biblical languages? This problem is one for the whole Church to determine. General Assembly must determine whether an adequate ministry for our time shall know Hebrew and Greek. And when Presbyteries persistently waive the rule, not simply to ordain the occasional person, but to advise candidates for the ministry that they may be ordained without fulfilling one of the rules, then General Assembly must act either, 1. to interpret and uphold the standards of this high office, or 2. to set on foot a proposal to change the standards.

E

This issue concerns our theological seminaries. They are trying to fulfill the standards for ordination. But, why should they be required to make room in an already overcrowded curriculum for Greek and Hebrew when students may attend non-Presbyterian seminaries, receive the B.D. degree, and be ordained without Greek and Hebrew?

In a time when the United Presbyterian Church is giving a high priority to theological education, it seems rather double-minded to support our own seminaries so eagerly and yet ordain many persons who enter our ministry but who receive their B.D. degrees without Greek and Hebrew. Do we give support to our seminaries that are obligated to teach Greek and Hebrew and yet secretly believe in a theological education that does not require Greek and Hebrew? This is rather inconsistent.

The seminaries of the United Presbyterian Church do believe in a learned ministry. They wish to uphold the language requirements. They are teaching these languages more effectively. And there seems to be a desire on the part of most seminary students to pursue Greek and Hebrew. In fact, several seminaries wish to require students to have Greek as an entrance requirement.

But, in spite of what the seminaries believe about an adequate education for the ministry of our time, they do *not* ordain persons for the ministry. The B.D. degree is a mark of academic achievement and of ministerial competence. Seminaries are pleased to give Presbyteries reports on their graduates' fitness for the ministry. However, no Presbytery should ordain a seminary graduate simply because he has earned the B.D. degree! *But, only Presbytery* can ordain into the ministry! *And only the General Assembly can set the standards for examination and ordination!*

F

The time has come for several matters to be seriously considered:

1. Are Greek and Hebrew essential parts of trial for ordination into the ministry of the United Presbyterian Church in our time?
2. If they are essential in the life and work of an adequate ministry of our time, has not the time come for the General Assembly to insist upon the fulfillment of the rule, except in unusual situations?
3. If the Biblical languages are important in theological education, must not Presbyteries instruct their candidates to secure a theological education which includes Hebrew and Greek?

If, however, Presbyteries are waiving the rule regarding the requirement in the Biblical languages, and this action is symptomatic of a widespread opinion that these languages are no longer a part of an adequately trained ministry, then a move should be inaugurated in General Assembly to revise or abolish the rule. Otherwise, we shall go on giving assent to a rule which we disregard in practice. This state of affairs is not good for the ministry, the Church, the seminaries, or for the candidates for the ministry.

Whatever is done, the seminaries are deeply interested in this problem. They are responsible for the education of the ministers of the Church. They wish to be guided by the mind of the Church. But even more, they wish to give the

Church guidance in determining the standards of the ministry of the Church. For the conception of an adequate ministry is a cooperative task which must be determined primarily by the Church under the guidance of the Word and Spirit of God in the light of the present situation.

II

A HEBREW AMONG THE SCHOLARS

EDWIN M. GOOD

IT may be true, as I sometimes facetiously tell my students, that one can talk to God only if he knows Hebrew. We shall find out in due time. One ought never to say any such thing out loud in a University such as the one which is my own academic habitation. But I am more and more impressed by what seems to me evidence that in that academic context the kind of thinking that goes with the Hebrew language can get a hearing and an interested response. It may be merely, "What will this babbler say?" But I sense here and there a certain excitement, a certain quickening of the intellect's muscles, at the stimulus of a different kind of approach to the process of thought.

I do not think that this is merely an aspect of the "resurgence of religion on the campus." Nor does it represent only a weariness with secular alternatives. I have the impression, rather, that the spheres of intellectual interest are shifting rapidly, and involved in the shift is a new willingness to listen to new (or old) slants on the significance of life. Among other developments, the re-introduction of the theological viewpoint into the academic conversation is pretty well an established fact, closely tied to the contemporary revitalization of theology. But the distinctive Hebraic outlook, with its human and social concreteness, its total immersion in life and history, its oblivion to speculation, its interest in the oneness of deed and word, and even its blunt and pervasive sense of historic obedience to God—this, I think, the academic mind begins to feel may be a live intellectual option.

Why is this? In part, it is simply an openness to all kinds of once discredited alternatives. But in part, if I read my Hebrew anywhere nearly correctly, it is because there are movements in some of the staple disciplines that are in certain ways coming to approximate the peculiar attitude to life that characterized the ancient Hebrews. This is a curious state of affairs. Christian apologetics has always proceeded on the assumption that conversation with the world involves a transposition of faith into the language and terminology of culture. Now I get the odd feeling that those efforts at translation and transposition may not be our best line of advance, but that, for whatever reason, the world may be prepared to listen to the original tongue, translated, to be sure, but not transformed.

Before going further, I should prepare to defend myself by setting out

what I take to be characteristic of the Hebraic mind. I am able to do no more than sketch it, but a sketch may be useful.

From the structure of the Hebrew language, with its primal verbal roots, we would expect the focus of Hebrew thought to be on action. This, indeed, is what we find. The Hebraic mind is concerned quite pragmatically with what one does, and not with what, in any metaphysical sense at all, he is. From that comes the familiar awareness that the Hebrew is interested in history and only derivatively in nature; that historic redemption, not essential structure, preoccupies him. He is concerned with what *happens*, not with what *is*.

Now, what happens in history is viewed on the analogy of the confrontation of personality, with its concomitants of speech, response, demand, and activity. Truth, in a famous phrase, is to be done; it is what is done by or what happens among persons. It is, in short, relational. The person, then, can be defined only in terms of the actions which establish his relationships. Yahweh is he who brought Israel out of Egypt. That statement itself intimates the action and relation of covenant. And theology in the Hebraic sense is the articulation of the active implications of the relationship resulting from and included in the actions of God. Situated, then, in the center of a community dedicated to a God of activity, the Hebrew mind concerns itself with the full range of covenantal activities in human society.

(The foregoing paragraphs are a highly tentative and preliminary sketch. They represent what now appear to me to be basic assumptions and structures, but one could, I am sure, extend, qualify, and modify them through several volumes.)

A

Let me now illustrate the thesis I proposed earlier, briefly and inconclusively.

It is a truism to say that the old "faculty psychology," with its division of labor among reason, emotion, and will, is gone, shot to pieces by decades of experiment and observation. In its place I think I see two things. One is behaviorism, which is solely interested, as far as I can make out, in what makes people act as they do. This can become obscurantist, when it goes to the length —as one colleague reported it here—of being concerned only with what transpires between stimulus and response. But it has the salutary effect of probing not into compartments of the psyche but into the behavior of the whole person. The other direction from faculty psychology is the so-called "depth psychology" in all its many forms. And this too, in perhaps a more profound and realistic way, studies the person, not to take him apart but to put him together, to envision him as a whole. But both of these directions, concerned as they are with the behavior of persons, must talk seriously about the history of personality, about those historic experiences and commitments around which behavior revolves.

Since Johannes Pedersen, the Hebrew understanding of man as *nephesh ḥayyah*, "living whole" if you like, has been written on the hearts of theologians. But the interesting thing to me is that when the theologian says this *as a theologian*, not as an amateur psychiatrist, the psychologist evinces some in-

terest. No one would accuse him of wanting Biblical support for his position; he is simply interested that a theological statement makes some psychological sense. With his concern for the history of personality, he is becoming prepared to talk even about history in a more general sense, perhaps in terms of Jung's "collective unconscious," which bears some relation to that "corporate personality" that has a place in the Hebraic mind.

B

Take the realm of philosophy. Discussions with philosophical colleagues give the impression that for the time being metaphysics is not of much interest to them. They seem to feel that metaphysical options have been fairly thoroughly canvassed with no appreciable illumination. And they are often quite disarmed to learn that theologians are much less occupied than they were with grinding metaphysical axes. What is of interest to philosophers? Again, I think there are two things. One of them is existentialism, though this is much less an American than a continental preoccupation. And what is existentialism, after all, but the insistence that the meaning of human life is to be found not "out there" in speculative conceptualization but in decision responding to the immediate demand of life, that life, as Martin Buber has it, is to be staked on one's thinking? And although some of the existentialist terminology seems to me ill-fitted to what it is saying (talk about Being, for example), the philosopher concerned with it gets a different look on his face when one begins to talk about the Hebrew sense of spontaneous decision and unremitting relational responsibility. To be sure, this is not simply existential*ism*, but the convergences of the two are undeniable.

The other major direction philosophy has taken is within logic and its corollary of linguistic analysis. This can, of course, end up in pure mathematics, and there I am left far behind. But no one at Princeton Seminary, with John Hick presumably always breathing down his neck, can ignore the fact that some of the most exciting theological writing going on is a spate of philosophical essays analyzing theological language, asking what we mean to say when we make theological statements. Some of them, I think, are finding some logical sense in non-metaphysical theological affirmations, affirmations that move in the realm of historical consciousness rather than in the realm of structure and essence. As they sharpen their method, these philosophers will be in an increasingly advantageous position to help us out. At the least, they have a way of raising very penetrating questions.

C

One other example. The historians are becoming interested again. The old positivism of Ranke and others, necessary as it was and productive of historiographical tools, has, I think, given way. I am not yet sure to what it has given way, and I don't think the historians are either. But they are increasingly concerned with the interpretation of history, with history both as the realm of concrete human existence and as the occasion for human decision. A historian like Karl Löwith ends his book, *Meaning in History*, with a chapter on the Bible. A Stanford history honors seminar on interpretations of history spends four weeks of a ten-week

quarter on Biblical concepts of history. It is cause for rejoicing, if only at the fact that the historian considers the Biblical mind sufficiently significant for his discipline to apply himself to it with care.

I am aware that all of this is barely a beginning. I also realize that the most I have been able to do with the Hebraic mind is to hint at it, rather than to give a coherent account of it. Until such an account can be drawn together, the point I have tried to make will remain tentative. It *is* tentative anyway. It may well be the case that the relative hospitality of these and other academic disciplines to theological and Hebraic comments on subjects of their interest is temporary, representing the flux of a secular mentality that is still grasping at every promising clue. I would not want to draw any far-reaching or premature conclusions from such relative hospitality. It may even be the case that I am so far gone in delusion as not to recognize how far my own apprehension of the Hebrew mind is colored by the intellectual movements around me. But I find it somehow encouraging that the kind of thinking in the Hebrew Bible, which I have personally discovered to have considerable relevance for the form of my own thinking, strikes an intellectual chord which, while it may not be exactly harmonic, gives indication of being at least euphonious.

III

ARE THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES WORTH STUDYING?

Thomas P. Lindsay

Time was when the study of the original languages of Scripture was taken for granted as an essential part of the minister's preparation for his calling. To a great extent this assumption was related to the prevailing conviction that the biblical writings were verbally inspired and infallible in every way. Therefore, it was necessary that the interpreter and expositor of these writings should be familiar with them in their original form. The versions were not enough. The final word was not to be found in English, even though authorized by a king and parliament. It was to be found in the Hebrew and Greek, with some consideration also for the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament.

At the present time we find a strong reluctance on the part of ministerial students to tackle the original languages. The Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts no longer hold the character of finality which they once held. The Word of God comes through them, but not in them, and it can come just as easily through some contemporary translation. We have no dearth of modern versions. We have the Revised Standard Version, the work of a company of first-class scholars. Why, then, waste precious time in the arduous discipline of the ancient languages? We have other, more-pressing, things to do.

This idea that the study of the original languages is a waste of time for the man who plans to go into the pastoral ministry is symptomatic of a revolutionary change which has taken place in the ministry. We have lost our sense of the priority of preaching. We are no longer going to save the world by "the folly of what we preach"; we are going to save it by efficient church administration, pastoral psychology, liturgical esthetics, social pronouncements, and the like. We are so busy with the mechanics of church life that we throw our sermons together from ideas culled from the latest books and fail to take seriously the Book of books. The popularity of topical preaching over biblical preaching is one evidence of this. I do not mean to despise church administration, pastoral psychology, liturgies, social pronouncement, and topical preaching. They have their place, but in many of our churches they have gotten out of place.

Reformed theology insists on the priority of Scripture in both our doctrine and our preaching. This does not mean going back to a sterile, mechanical concept of the biblical writings. The function of historical and literary criticism is well established—better established than some of its conclusions. It has cast new light on God's word to man.

A

Why, then, the original languages? For the simple reason that only the originals reveal the full meaning of the writers. They provide a psychological insight into the culture, out of which the authors have written. There are not only shades of meaning in the words but also a cultural heritage behind the words, the grammatical construction, and the literary form which no translation can adequately convey. The untrained ear may not catch the difference between Verdi's *Requiem* in Latin and the same work in its English translation, but the trained musician knows at once that something important is lost when the original is forsaken. We cannot catch as we ought the mind of the prophets and the apostles by reading the English translation or taking second-hand what somebody else has to say about them. We need "the feel" which only a knowledge of their languages can give us.

This does not mean that the pastor and preacher need become a technical expert in Hebrew and Greek. It does mean that he ought to have enough of the languages to be at home with those who thought, spoke and wrote in them. It means too that he can use profitably the scholarly commentaries, exercising some personal criticism in his use of them. It means too that he will bring out the true meaning of Scripture in his preaching, avoiding foolish and erroneous interpretations. In brief, it means that he has completely identified himself with those to whom and through whom God spoke His word of redemption and hope. It is by such identification that the contemporary preacher becomes the channel of God's eternal word.

B

Such a knowledge of the original language will spoil some of our pet sermons, but it will enhance all our preaching. Allow me, in closing, to mention by way of illustration of all this, two familiar texts on which I have heard innumerable sermons by preachers who did not bother to go back to the original language. One is from the

Old Testament: "Where there is no vision, the people perish" (Proverbs 29: 18-AV). How often on the basis of this text have we been exhorted in good humanistic fashion to be men of vision, to think great thoughts, dream great dreams and the like! But the Hebrew חזון refers to the prophetic vision of God by the seer. Fortunately the RSV does better than the AV—"Where there is no prophecy the people cast off restraint, but blessed is he who keeps the law." This is really a good text for preaching on the importance of Scripture—"prophecy" and "the law." The other much abused text, which a knowledge of the original would set straight, is *Hebrews* 12:1. Ofttimes I have squirmed in my seat as I have listened to preachers—eloquent in speech but lacking in knowledge—describing the cloud of witnesses looking down upon us, and watching every move we make. They took the familiar words of the English versions (RSV is no better here than AV), failing to distinguish between μαρτυρέω and θεάομαι. The text is not a threat to the careless, but an encouragement to the faithful; it sums up the testimony of the great men of God in ages past, to whom reference is made in the previous chapter, who tell us of the part that faith played in their lives.

Good preaching does not come easy; nor does it come second-hand. It is an arduous discipline—and the study and knowledge of the original languages of Holy Scripture is an important part of that discipline.

IV

ON THE STUDY OF HEBREW AND GREEK

Bruce M. Metzger

A perennial subject of discussion at the annual sessions of the Presbyterian Church's Council on Theological Education is the question of the place of the study of Hebrew and Greek in the preparation of the theological student for meeting the manifold tasks that confront the minister today. Inasmuch as several recommendations were finally passed at the meeting of the Council in October, 1959, which bear upon this matter, and, furthermore, inasmuch as the substance of a number of these recommendations reflects certain information derived from a questionnaire that was sent to more than four hundred alumni of Princeton Theological Seminary, it may be of interest to readers of the Bulletin to have a report regarding the background and content of the recommendations.

It should be stated first of all that the Council on Theological Education of the United Presbyterian Church is a representative group composed of the president of each of the Church's seminaries and a number of the members of the faculty and the board of trustees of each institution (these are chosen in accord with the proportionate size of the seminary, and serve for a term of three years). In addition there are six

representatives from the Church at large, four representatives from the Board of Christian Education, and one representative each from the Board of National Missions and the Commission on Ecumenical Missions. Moreover, Yale Divinity School and Union Theological Seminary (each of which has more than fifty B.D. students looking forward to ordination in the Presbyterian Church) send one representative each who has voice but no vote in the meetings of the Council.

In the autumn of 1958 the Curriculum Committee of the Council appointed a sub-committee to examine once again the question of the study of Hebrew and Greek in relation to the requirements for the B.D. degree, and to make a report to the next meeting of the Council. The four members who were appointed to serve on the sub-committee were Dr. Norman A. Horner, Dean and Professor of Missions at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, Dr. Cornelius DeBoe, Dean and Professor of Philosophy at Jamestown College, Dr. Ray J. Harmelink, Associate General Secretary of the Board of Christian Education, and the present writer.

As a preliminary step prior to meeting to discuss the matter committed to its attention, the sub-committee collected data from seminary teachers of the Biblical languages as well as from recent B.D. graduates. During November, 1958, the chairman, Dean Horner, sent questionnaires to thirty professors of Old Testament and New Testament in all the seminaries of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., the Presbyterian Church, U.S., and the Cumberland and Associate Reformed Presbyterian Churches. These professors were invited to indicate the present requirements in Hebrew and Greek at their respective seminaries; the prerequisite of college Greek; the average enrollment in elective courses in the Biblical languages; the feasibility or desirability of modified courses to meet the B.D. requirements of students who may seem to have less than average aptitude for language study; the extent to which professors in other departments make a knowledge of the Biblical languages relevant to their courses; the relationship between incompetence in English grammar and difficulty in learning Hebrew and Greek; and the possible usefulness of language aptitude tests at the time of enrollment of seminary students.

Replies to this questionnaire were received from seventy per cent of the professors solicited and included a response from every United Presbyterian seminary except San Francisco. It was learned that the amount of Hebrew and Greek prescribed at the Presbyterian seminaries differs widely. The Hebrew requirement is currently from four to thirteen semester hours averaging about eight semester hours. The Greek requirement (beyond elementary Greek which is ideally completed in college) is from four to ten semester hours, averaging about seven semester hours. The subcommittee noted that these requirements are no greater than those made in other theological disciplines, and are significantly less than in some of the others.

In December, 1958, questionnaires were mailed by the present writer to 426 Princeton B.D. graduates of the previous five years. Dean Horner sent a similar but not identical questionnaire to 180 Louisville graduates of the same five year period. (The five year period was chosen because it has been within

the past several years that newer methods in teaching the Biblical languages have been inaugurated in most of our seminaries.) The sub-committee also had certain information derived from a similar type of questionnaire mailed a few years ago to 275 McCormick Seminary alumni.

The following are the questions which were addressed to B.D. graduates of Princeton Seminary between the years 1954 and 1958 inclusive. The names and addresses were supplied by the office of public relations and include only those graduates who reside in continental United States.

1. Do you feel that you have benefited from your study of Hebrew and Greek?

2. If you have answered No. 1 affirmatively, please indicate one or more ways in which you have been benefited from your study of the Biblical languages.

3. Do you think that more time, the same amount of time, or less time should be required for the exegesis of Hebrew and Greek texts? (You may recall that a one term course of three hours is currently required for Hebrew exegesis, and a similar course for Greek exegesis.)

4. If you answered No. 3 by suggesting either "more time" or "less time," please indicate about how much more or less time you would propose.

5. Do you feel that in other required courses of the Seminary curriculum more time or less time should be required?

6. All things considered, do you think that a knowledge of elementary Greek (representing at least one year of college Greek, and preferably two) should be required of B.D. candidates before admission to Seminary? (It is understood that men deciding late in their college work to enter the ministry, and graduates of colleges where Greek is not offered, might meet such a requirement by taking a concentrated summer course in Greek at Seminary prior to the beginning of the Junior year.)

7. As an alternative to No. 6, do you think that a four-year B.D. course should be required?

8. Have you any suggestions concerning the methods of teaching the original languages of Scripture in the Seminary?

9. Have you any suggestions as to the securing of a wider utilization of the original languages in various Seminary courses offered in departments other than the Biblical department?

10. How far do you think it likely that a better knowledge of English grammar would have benefited you in the study of Hebrew and Greek? If you answer affirmatively, do you have any suggestions as to how the Seminary might take steps to correct deficiencies in English?

At the close of the questionnaire, the recipient was invited to make further comments if he so desired. Though no signature was requested, many voluntarily identified themselves.

Replies were received from more than fifty-five per cent of those solicited by both Dean Horner and the present writer. Overwhelmingly the replies favored retaining at least the present requirements in the Biblical languages. The sub-committee was also informed that the response to the McCormick Seminary questionnaire indicated that about seventy-five per cent of those who re-

plied favored retention of the present language requirements.

By way of indicating the nature and range of the replies which were received in response to the questionnaire sent to Princeton alumni, the following is a résumé of statistics as well as certain representative answers which are quoted verbatim.

In reply to the first question, there were 166 who voted "yes" (20 of these added some enthusiastic qualification, such as "definitely," "very definitely," "no question about it," "tremendously," "especially Hebrew," etc.) ; a qualified "yes" (e.g. "to a certain degree," "in certain areas," "somewhat," "slightly," etc.) was voted by 15 others ; four voted "no" and four voted "no" as regards Hebrew.

The second question, as one might imagine, brought a very wide range of replies. Those of most frequent occurrence were:

Aid in sermon preparation, 70
Appreciation of Hebrew and Greek mentality, 61
Gives depth to the study of the Bible, 60
Permits intelligent use of critical commentaries, concordances, and lexicons, 45
Enables one to make word studies, 40
Gives an appreciation of the problems of translating the Bible, 30
Gives one greater confidence in interpreting the Scriptures, 18
Makes for discipline in study habits, 11
Increases one's love for the Bible, 11
Frees one from a fundamentalistic literalism, 8

The statistics of answers to the third question are as follows:

	More time	*No change in requirement*	*Less time*
Hebrew exegesis	62	74	36
Greek exegesis	86	69	21

To the fourth question many different suggestions were made, the predominant suggestion being the addition of another three hour course in Hebrew exegesis and another three hour course in Greek exegesis.

No trend could be observed in the diverse replies to the fifth question. About as many suggestions were made in favor of an increase of the time devoted to certain courses as there were other suggestions for the limitation or abolition of the same courses!

In reply to the sixth question there were 110 affirmative votes and 59 negative votes.[1]

In answer to the seventh question, 60 replied "yes" and 31 others voted "yes" with the proviso that the added year be one of supervised internship. Twenty more voted "yes" with the recommendation that the Th.M. degree be granted. There were 57 negative votes.[1]

The remaining questions drew forth a wide range of suggestions, some of which were incorporated into the recommendations made by the sub-committee.

Particularly interesting were the comments which some included at the close of their questionnaire. Several were frankly condemnatory of the requirement of the Biblical languages. A few others showed a certain amount of ambivalence in their estimate of the value of the languages in the ministry. The great majority, however, indicated in various ways their appreciation of

[1] Not everyone answered questions Nos. 6 and 7.

a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. Several of these remarks are reproduced here. They have been selected as typical from a much larger number of comments in strict accord with the proportion of favorable, unfavorable, and ambivalent comments expressed in the total number of replies.

"Let me say finally that I am somewhat amazed at the extent my views have been changed since graduation. In one year and a half in parish work I am increasingly amazed how basically important both Greek and Hebrew can be for the minister's understanding and appreciation."

"Although I proved myself to be a very poor language student with regard to both Greek and Hebrew, and had to work especially hard to pass the requirements, I am firmly convinced that both of these languages should remain as required subjects in our theological curricula."

"I was not a top student of Greek or Hebrew, although my grades were good. I feel that there is one unassailable argument for requiring Greek and Hebrew for all B.D. candidates. It is this: men who suspected no great talent for Greek and Hebrew, men who suspected no possible interest in the Biblical languages have found their field of service to Christ and his Church simply because they were required to take the work and subsequently discovered it was their meat."

"I was organizing pastor of a new church in a new suburban development, and this type of work makes heavy demands upon a pastor's time. Nevertheless I still use the original languages (mostly Greek)—I don't see how I could get along without them. I do not begrudge the time I spent in this area at Seminary."

"I would feel absolutely helpless in preaching without the closeness to the apostolic witness which use of the Greek N.T. makes possible. I have found knowledge of the Bible (and especially the Greek N.T.) invaluable as a pastoral tool for correction of popular misconceptions in doctrine and Bible lore, and thereby ultimately of direct use in the nurturing of souls."

"Though my parish is small, simple, and rural, I have found frequent, even daily use for Greek and Hebrew. In many cases I feel that my people are interested and sincerely thankful that we are able to find fresh meaning in the Old and New Testament through some help from the original languages."

"The study of Hebrew has made the O.T. come alive for me for the first time. The elementary knowledge of both Hebrew and Greek has been invaluable in Biblical study and sermon preparation."

"At the time of my study I could see no value [in the Biblical languages], but do appreciate them now."

"Hebrew especially is useful for vivid communication of the Biblical outlook in sermons and talks and teaching."

"As an undergraduate I could think of all kinds of logical reasons why I should know less about Hebrew and Greek and more about how to make a 'pastoral call.' I now know that they are not unrelated and feel that Hebrew and Greek provide the only real means for the pastoral understanding of the Word."

"Though I seldom use Hebrew in day to day practice, and I admit my use of Greek is not extensive or as prevalent as it should be, still I feel that the study in these basic languages does something for you in your perspective of the ministry which cannot be found otherwise and is very helpful even though not put into daily use."

"A 'little' language is senseless. Unless there is enough required to assure some competency, the whole time spent is lost."

"I feel it better to have considerable knowledge in one language rather than mediocre ability in both."

"I feel that entirely too much emphasis is placed on the original Biblical languages. I am willing to confess, with no shame or conscience, that I have not used either Greek or Hebrew since I have been in the ministry. . . . My time spent in Seminary on languages could have been far better spent on other subjects."

"In Seminary I felt language study a waste of valuable time—in the same way that it would be to require a person to pass a course in machine-shop practice before granting him an automobile driver's license."

On the basis of an analysis of the results of the information secured from the four different questionnaires, at a meeting in February, 1959, the sub-committee drew up a series of recommendations directed to Presbyterian colleges, to the seminaries, and to the Presbyteries of the Church. After further discussion of the wording of these recommendations, both by mail and as a group, the sub-committee made its report to the parent committee. After some discussion and the addition of a concluding paragraph (section D of the report), the recommendations were presented to the Council on Theological Education by the chairman of the Council's Curriculum Committee, Dean Gordon E. Jackson of Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary. The Council voted unanimously to accept all the recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

A. *To Presbyterian Colleges*

1. That the curriculum recommendations of the American Association of Theological Schools for pre-seminary students, as revised in 1956, be called to the attention of all such students by their colleges. This statement on pre-seminary studies is available in leaflet form, free of charge, from the office of the Executive Director of the A.A.T.S.
2. That the colleges emphasize the importance of one year, and preferably two years, of Greek for students prior to entering seminary in order to relieve the pressure during the first year at seminary.
3. That pre-seminary students be advised to take advantage of adequate training in English grammar and creative writing. Students who are deficient in the knowledge of English grammar may be required by the seminaries to take remedial work in English as a non-credit course. Along with the more obvious value of competence in written English, there is a direct relationship between the knowledge of English grammar and facility in the study of Greek and Hebrew.

B. *To the Seminaries*

1. That church and seminary recruitment programs urgently encourage candidates to include Greek in their college courses of study; and that the seminaries be encouraged to make provision for summer courses in elementary Greek, so that a student may secure this knowledge before beginning his seminary course, as well as providing for such courses during the regular academic year.
2. That careful attention be given to pedagogical ability as well as scholarly competence in selecting teaching fellows who can make the elementary language courses vital.
3. That enough exegetical work in both languages be required to justify the time spent on grammar and vocabulary in the elementary courses. Abridged or "quickie" courses are not feasible for the adequate preparation of theological students. We report this finding without any intention of discouraging further experimentation in accelerated courses for students with superior language aptitude or modified teaching methods for those with apparently inferior language aptitude.
4. That attention be given to the fact that language teaching is most effectively accomplished in classes small enough to permit individual attention.
5. That, in the interest of correlating various departments of the curriculum, the Scripture passages examined in the language courses include those suggested by professors of the other disciplines as "key passages" which will be emphasized in their courses. Similarly, the other departments (e.g. Homiletics) should make maximum use of the Biblical languages.

C. *To the Presbyteries*

That whenever Presbytery gives approval for a ministerial candidate to attend a seminary not requiring Biblical languages in the B.D. program, the Presbytery advise the candidate of the requirements set forth in Chapter XIX, Section 2, of the *Form of Government.* It should be noted that no provision is made in the Constitution for deleting either Hebrew or Greek from theological preparation, although provision is made for accepting credit from a creditable institution in lieu of Presbytery examination. Any exemption from the language requirement must be made by a three-fourths majority vote of Presbytery.

D. That this action of the Council be communicated by the Secretary of the Council to the colleges and seminaries of the United Presbyterian Church, and through the Department of Vocation and In-Service Training of the Board of Christian Education to the Committees on Supervision of Candidates in the several Presbyteries of the Church, and to the Chaplains of the denominational colleges, and to the directors of Westminster Foundations and university pastors on university campuses.

As will be seen from the nature of the questionnaires sent out, it was the intention of the sub-committee to concentrate at this stage on certain pedagogical aspects of the language require-

ments for the B.D. degree. Its recommendations in this area are based on data secured from a variety of samplings of informed opinion. Other aspects of the subject, such as the relation of the Biblical languages to the theological curriculum as a whole, as well as certain methodological problems of teaching techniques, are to be dealt with by the sub-committee, now enlarged by the appointment of four additional members, namely Dr. David N. Freedman, Professor of Old Testament at Pittsburgh Seminary, Dr. Joseph Haroutunian, Professor of Systematic Theology at McCormick Seminary, Dr. Elmer G. Homrighausen, Dean at Princeton Seminary, and Dr. Elwyn A. Smith, Professor of Church History at Pittsburgh Seminary. The precise formulation of the Council's assignment to the subcommittee is "to make an extensive study of the theological and practical implications of the place of the Biblical languages in theological education."

In anticipation, therefore, of the further consideration which will be devoted to the place of Hebrew and Greek in the preparation of Presbyterian ministers, alumni of Princeton Seminary are invited to communicate to the present writer their best wisdom on any and all aspects of the study and use of the Biblical languages. Thus an opportunity will be afforded to all to participate in some measure in the on-going task of redefining the aims and the content of theological education.

The "American way of life," which is so much lauded today in church and secular circles in our nation, is deeply infected with this negative anarchic conception of freedom, a conception so utterly alien to the true American tradition. The refusal to submit to absolute standards of behavior, the canonization of desire, and the enthronement of self-interest and personal advancement into the seat of Deity, constitute a new serfdom. Personal popularity, favorable public opinion, the acclaim of the masses, the satisfaction of appetites, the increase of security—"These be Thy Gods, O Israel." When these goals are pursued as absolutes, of dividends, the lure of political office, the attainment of ballistic power, all in the sunshine as they are in innumerable instances, they become sacred divinities in the Pantheon of a new and ominous national spirit. Their worshipers, though they know it not, are "men in chains," bound by the "chains of their own iron wills." Glorying in their freedom, they are the abject slaves of their willful determination to follow the cravings of desire or the dictates of pride which have become their masters.

—John A. Mackay, *The Presbyterian Way of Life* (Prentice-Hall, 1960), p. 82.

TO THE ENDS OF THE EARTH AND THE END OF TIME

John Coventry Smith

Martin Marty, in a recent article in *The Christian Century* analyzes the progress of the Christian Church toward unity and co-operation in the last fifty years. He believes that this progress has been considerable, but he also believes that in these same years there has been a failure of the nerve of Mission. He does not cite the reasons for this failure, but certainly the principal one has been an inadequate understanding of the Biblical and theological basis for the Mission of the Church. There is no longer any burning sense of urgency for the preaching of the Gospel to the ends of the earth.

I am glad that I belong to a creedal Church. I believe it is important to be able to express, even in an imperfect human form, what we believe about the great doctrines of the Christian faith. But I also believe that every generation should write its own creed; remaining true to the heritage of the past, our faith must be expressed in terms that each generation can understand.

There was a time when a considerable proportion of the Church refused to face the need of re-interpreting the Christian faith for the new generation. I remember a day in Japan when one missionary stated clearly before a committee of the Japanese Church that he believed the whole counsel of God was contained in the Westminster Confession and that until that Confession had been translated into Japanese and made the creed of the Japanese Church, he could not enter into full fellowship with that Church.

But in our time there has also been a considerable portion of the Church who refuse to repeat the theological statements of the past, but also refuse to face the arduous task of forming their own theological statements. They simply ride along in a rosy glow of sentiment, depending on the impetus of the past to thrust them into the Church's Mission.

Fortunately, for the last fifteen or twenty years, neither of these extremes has represented the main stream of the Church's life. The majority have been concerned with the recovery of an emphasis on Biblical and theological thought. Wholesome advance has been made in interpreting our faith to our own generation. We now are convinced that such study is necessary, and we have made some progress in our study.

Some of this progress has been made in the field of the theology of Mission. I am convinced that we are on the right road in this field, but I am also convinced we still have far to go before this generation of Christians recaptures the urgency of Mission. It is our purpose in this paper to try to state what has been accomplished and what remains to be done; not that I am in any sense adequate for this task as a theologian, but at least as a student of theology I can share with you some of my own thinking.

Let us begin where the Advisory

Study Committee of our own Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations has begun. This Committee is composed of fifteen people from all over the world under the Chairmanship of Dr. C. H. Hwang of Formosa. It has charged itself with the task of stimulating study among all the Churches with which the Commission is related in Mission at the point of understanding the purpose of the Church as a missionary community.

The Committee begins with a portion of Scripture. It is not the Great Commission where a past generation would have begun. The Committee does not underestimate the Great Commission, but it understands that the Great Commission itself makes certain assumptions which this generation does not accept. Therefore, the Committee begins at the very beginning. Its first reference is to Colossians 1:15-20 in Phillips' translation:

> "Now Christ is the visible expression of the invisible God. He existed before creation began, for it was through him that everything was made, whether spiritual or material, seen or unseen. Through him, and for him, also, were created power and dominion, ownership and authority. In fact, every single thing was created through, and for, him. He is both the first principle and the upholding principle of the whole scheme of creation. And now he is the head of the body which is composed of all Christian people. Life from nothing began through him, and life from the dead began through him, and he is, therefore, justly called the Lord of all. It was in him that the full nature of God chose to live, and through him God planned to reconcile in his own person, as it were, everything on earth and everything in heaven by virtue of the sacrifice of the cross."

This passage clearly indicates where the study of the theology of Mission must begin. God is the Creator of the world, not of one people, not of one nation, not of one culture or civilization, but of the whole world. And when man was estranged from God because of his disobedience and sin, "God so loved the world," not one nation or people or race, but "the world that He gave His only begotten Son. . . ." And when Jesus had been born in Bethlehem, and had lived at Nazareth, and had served his people in swift compassion for their every need, and had suffered upon the Cross, had died and rose again, God did not cease to be concerned with the whole world. In every generation, among every people, in the history of every nation, God has continued to be at work seeking to reconcile mankind unto Himself in Jesus Christ. This is the first thing that we must say about the Christian Gospel.

And secondly, we must say that God has summoned his disciples in every generation to participate with him in the accomplishment of his plan and purpose for the world. We have no choice in the matter. If we are disciples, we are witnesses. If we are Christians, we are missionaries. This is the very purpose of our being Christians; this is the very purpose of the existence of the Church. It is of its essence that it participate with God in reconciling mankind unto himself in Jesus Christ.

This task to which we are summoned is one that began before creation and which will be consummated in a vic-

tory beyond history which has already been won in Jesus Christ. This is what the Bible is all about. This is what human history is all about. God is at work accomplishing his plan and purpose for all of mankind. The Communist believes that he is participating in the progress of history. Hitler convinced his followers that his movement was "the wave of the future." Both of these ideas are borrowed from the Christian faith. It is the Christian who is part of the movement by which God plans to redeem the whole world. We do not know how or when God's purpose will be accomplished. But we are certain of its accomplishment, as certain as we are of God himself and of our very existence.

This summons to participate is not a summons to nurture ourselves within the four walls of a church. This is a summons to be at work in the world where God himself is at work. Bishop Lesslie Newbigin of the Church of South India has said that too often we have thought of the Christian life as a solo performance on the stage for which we will receive a bouquet of roses in the wings after the play is over. Dr. Masao Takenaka of the Doshisha Theological Seminary at Kyoto has said that too often we have thought of evangelism as the lifting of fish out of a dirty river called the world and placing them in a clean pool called the Church. Today we are beginning to understand that God asks us, not for a solo performance, but to become part of the drama where he is at work in the world, and that this takes place, not in the clean pool, but in the dirty river.

I was talking to Dr. Takenaka this past summer at St. Andrews. He told me of the challenge that had come to him this past year when he was invited to become the president of a labor union. It was a union of teachers of which he was a member. He had been on the executive committee, and now he was invited to become president of the union, giving one day a week to its business. He is a busy professor and active in the life of his Church. But he became convinced it was his Christian duty to accept this challenge and to participate in the leadership of the union, although the great majority of the union members are not Christians.

I am convinced that Protestants in Cuba today have a similar challenge before them. It would be easy for them not to participate at all in the revolution. They have realized, however, that not to participate is to identify themselves with Batista. And so they have supported the legitimate aims of the revolution. They have, of course, exposed themselves to misunderstanding. And they have exposed themselves to temptations which, in their political immaturity, have led them to make mistakes. But fundamentally they have been right. We should honor our brothers of the Protestant Church in Cuba and pray that their witness may be made faithfully and that they may withstand the temptations to error that come as they participate.

We are also increasingly clear that Christian participation in the world involves both proclamation and service. The proclamation of the Gospel by itself tends toward arrogance, as though we Christians were somehow superior beings. Acts of compassionate service are also a true expression of the Gospel in themselves and are also often necessary to enable people to hear the Gospel as it is proclaimed. But acts of service alone are not the Gospel, else this

might better be done impersonally through a Point Four Program. It is the cup of cold water given in the name of Christ which is the true symbol of the Christian concern for the needy people of the world. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as "evangelists" and "educators" and "medical personnel" in the Mission of the Church. All is evangelism in witness and service.

In these three things, then, we have made progress. It is God, the Creator of the world, who has planned to redeem the whole world in Jesus Christ. And he summons us to participate with him in the accomplishment of his purpose for all of mankind. And this summons is to work with him in the world, in the movements of history and of peoples where he is at work.

There are three other points, however, at which we are not yet clear, or at least it seems so to me. I am quite sure I shall be even more inadequate in outlining them than I have been thus far, and shall thus prove that at least in my own mind I do not yet have answers.

I

In the first place, we need to think more clearly about what happens to the individual who is confronted by the demands of Jesus Christ in history. Thus far, we have hesitated to do so; in fact, at times we are inclined to label concern for the personal experience of the Christian as a sort of pietism or emotionalism which we want to escape from. Perhaps it is our dour Scots-Irish ancestry which makes us Presbyterians hesitate to talk about the deepest spiritual experiences of life. But other confessions seem just as hesitant.

Personally, I think that the Biblical thought which we have reviewed thus far leads us directly to a consideration of the personal experience of the Christian. If God is at work in the world confronting this generation with his plan of reconciliation for all of mankind, then He is confronting us with this same plan of reconciliation in Jesus Christ. Even the uncertainties of our time, the fact that man has discovered the power by which he can destroy himself and the world, can be used of God to convince us of our need of something that goes deeper than the material world. For God is constantly at work showing us that the hour in which we accept Jesus Christ as our Savior and make him the Lord of our lives, is the most important hour in our history. This we need to understand.

Perhaps it is our uncertainty in measuring this experience that makes us also uncertain about the decisive nature of our acceptance or rejection of Jesus Christ. When we preach the Gospel, we sound like Universalists. We are not. We are true to the Bible and to our historic theology at this point. But we dwell only upon the result of accepting Jesus Christ. We scarcely ever mention the ultimate result of our finally rejecting Him.

I do not mean that you and I can judge who has accepted and who has not. This is in the hands of God. God also will determine what happens beyond history and beyond judgment. But the Scripture leaves no doubt as to the reality of judgment itself. Man's freedom of choice logically leaves him no escape from the consequences of his final rejection of God's forgiveness. This is an integral part of the Gospel about which we say very little.

Our uncertainty here leads us to be

uncertain in our thinking about the so-called non-Christian religions. Here in modern times we have vacillated between two extremes. Some, like Arnold Toynbee, have believed that even the Christian, on the basis of his own virtue of tolerance, ought to regard other religions as being somehow of equal importance with his own. The most familiar description of this is in the figure of a mountain where there are several roads which all lead to the top. Actually, even in climbing a mountain, a great deal depends on what the climber believes is at the top. What a man does on the road may be greatly influenced by a belief that life ends in nothing or by a belief that our lives are in the hands of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Moreover, the Christian who accepts the thesis that all religions are essentially alike has forfeited the central truth of his own faith. A Buddhist or a Hindu can accept this thesis without compromise, for he already believes that nothing really eternal or absolute exists and that all things are relative. But the Christian believes there is an absolute unchangeable God revealed to us in Jesus Christ. For him to say that all religions are more or less alike and that truth is relative, is to sacrifice the very foundation of his faith.

I am not saying, of course, that all that is within the Christian faith as we practice it is right and that all that is within the non-Christian religions is wrong. God has not left himself without a witness. His Spirit has stirred up the spirit of man. And many, like Abraham, may have their faith counted unto them for righteousness long before the coming of Jesus Christ into their world. But Christ is still the climax, still the crown of what God has in store for all of mankind.

At the other extreme are those, like the early Hendrick Kraemer, who somehow believe that there are man-made religions and then there is Christianity. And they thus seek to remove Christianity from any possible criticism through the study of history or sociology or psychology or anthropology. This seems to me only to add to the dangers of arrogance among Christians and to misunderstandings among non-Christians.

More recently, several theological writers have attacked the problem from another direction that seems to me to be more fruitful. They contend that there are religions, including Christianity. And then there is what God has done for all mankind in Jesus Christ. And all of us, Christian and non-Christian alike, are judged by the truth which is in him alone. It is along this line that our hope of understanding lies. In such a framework, the Christian missionary can speak without hesitation and in all humility. We are all under judgment, and we all must seek more perfectly to understand what God is saying to us in Jesus Christ.

II

There is still a second aspect of our Christian faith which this generation has neglected. If we are to be disciples of the Master, there must be something of "discipline" about the Christian life. We have reacted against this. We are likely to say that any emphasis upon discipline is to exaggerate the outward form of the Christian life rather than its inner spirit. And this, of course, can be true. But there is an inner discipline which is also of the spirit. It expresses

itself in the discipline of private prayer, of Bible study, of worship, perhaps most of all in the discipline of integrity of character and of Christian love.

When I was a young missionary in Japan, I had an older friend who was a Japanese pastor of outstanding leadership. One of the things that I remarked about him was the fact that when tea was served, my friend never took any cake. Tea is served many times a day in Japan, and I had never seen anyone else who consistently refused cake or cookies with his tea. One day I asked him about it. He told me that when he was a young minister he had had a Bible class for university students. At times he talked to them about the drinking bouts that they had and the things that they did over the week end at the university. Finally they said to him, "You don't understand because you don't enjoy these things. This is no sacrifice on your part, so you have no right to talk to us about them." And so one day he said to them, "I like cake with my tea as everyone does. From now on I will give up cake. This is my sacrifice. This is my discipline." And so for forty years he had never tasted cake. One may say that this is a kind of Oriental asceticism, or that this may even become a temptation to outward display on the part of the Christian. And all this may be possible. But I regarded it then, and still regard it, as an evidence of Christian discipline in the life of my friend.

Certainly our generation could do with much more of Christian discipline than we have at present. And it is within this framework that obedience to the call of God is understood. The summons to be a witness wherever the Christian is, the call to go to the places where Christian witnesses are few, is not just a general commission which we accept but somehow never put into practice. If we are disciplined disciples, we are obedient when the summons comes to us. It is part of the fabric of being a Christian.

III

The third point that we Christians need to explore is the message of the Christian faith regarding the meaning of the world. A writer in *The New York Times*, at the beginning of the year, called 1960 P.H. 15, fifteen years after Hiroshima. Actually, our generation has scarcely begun to understand what the discovery of such tremendous explosive power means for mankind. We literally can now destroy ourselves and the whole inhabited world.

Life goes on as though this were not true. As we grow older, we come to understand that our personal physical lives must end. And in the Christian faith we find the hope that enables us to make our peace with death. But we have not yet made our peace with the possibility of the death of the whole world and of the human species.

There is evidence, however, that our generation is beginning to understand that the horrible fact is seeping down into our thinking. Let me cite one bit of evidence. It comes in a song, recorded by the Kingston Trio a year and a half ago and very popular among teenagers. The music is light, and the words are morbid. Here they are:

They're rioting in Africa
They're starving in Spain
There're hurricanes in Florida
And Texas needs rain.

The whole world is festering
With unhappy souls
The French hate the Germans
The Germans hate the Poles
Italians hate Yugoslavs
South Africans hate the Dutch;
And I don't like anybody very much.

But we can be tranquil and thankful and proud,
For man's been endowed with a mushroomed shaped cloud.

And we know for certain
That some lovely day
Someone will set the spark off
And we will all be blown away.

They're rioting in Africa
There's strife in Iran
What Nature doesn't do to us
Will be done by
Our fellowman.

There is a haunting meaninglessness about those words. That is how life appears to those who know only meaning within this world. When this generation finally awakens to the fact that the physical world can end within the next hour, then the cynicism of this song can become general.

For this also the Christian faith has an answer, largely unexplored by this generation. This world has a beginning. It has an end. The meaning of the world and of mankind is not found within their own brief history. The meaning is beyond history in God's plan and purpose. The Christian lives between the times, between the coming of Jesus Christ and the end of time. And the meaning of his life cannot be destroyed, either by his own death or by the end of the world.

You may say that I am now retreating from the position I took earlier, that the Christian must participate in the world. If the final meaning of life is realized beyond this world, then we no longer need regard our life here as being meaningful for this world. But for the Christian, this is not true. For him, eternal life begins here and now. And the way he participates in the life of this world marks the way he continues to participate in the life eternal. Only as the Christian begins to understand this, will life within this physical world escape its anxiety and become spiritually possible in this second half of the twentieth century.

A scientist from the Rand Corporation, writing in the *Saturday Evening Post* last summer, likens our small world to a cellar. The total area of the cellar is 25 feet by 25 feet, and in it dwell sixteen people, one of whom is an American. Part of the cellar is flooded, but there is enough dry ground so that each man has 2 feet by 6 feet where he can live and die and be buried. The American in the cellar has up to 50% of the cellar's "goodies." There is a gang in the cellar composed of four or five men who are banded together to change things, particularly to eliminate the American. And the American has a sort of club composed of others in the cellar who have some of the rest of the cellar's "goodies" and who seek to preserve the *status quo*. Every man in the cellar is armed, at least with a knife. And two or three have hand grenades which could destroy the whole cellar. And every man wants a hand grenade.

I told this story to a friend of mine, and he said, "Yes, and you'd send a missionary into the cellar."

Well, God did that. He sent His Son into the cellar. And they put Him to death; not just the gang, but all of

them together. And out of the sacrifice of the Cross came the hope of the world.

You and I, as Christians, are summoned to take up our crosses and follow Him, to offer ourselves in service as messengers of God's love and reconciliation to a desperate and needy world. God can use our obedience and sacrifice to bring hope for this world and for the world to come.

COMMENCEMENT, 1961

June 4 Baccalaureate Service

Preacher: The Rev. David B. Watermulder, D.D.
Oak Park Presbyterian Church, Chicago, Ill.

June 5 Class Reunions and Alumni Dinner

June 6 149th Annual Commencement

Speaker: The Rev. Samuel H. Miller, D.D.
Dean, Harvard Divinity School

INSTITUTE OF THEOLOGY

July 10-20, 1961

AN ALMOST CHOSEN PEOPLE

SERMON PREACHED IN THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY CHAPEL ON THANKSGIVING DAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1960

RICHARD LUECKE

LET me address you with some words spoken by Abraham Lincoln at the New Jersey statehouse in Trenton almost 100 years ago—as "an almost chosen people."

Our text is the Prophet Amos.

I

Amos was something new on the religion page when he showed up at the national shrine in Bethel. He did not preach because he was a member of the pastors' association and it was his turn. He didn't belong to any association and preached, as everyone thought who heard him, out of turn. "I am no prophet, nor one of the prophet's sons, but a herdsman and a dresser of sycamore trees," he admitted when they sent him home. "But the Lord took me from following the flock and the Lord said to me, 'Go, prophesy to my people Israel'" (7:14-15). He was not a professional prophet, but became the first of the great literary prophets—a turn of affairs to which we are becoming accustomed again today.

What Amos wrote was as plain as a blow on the face. He went after those who wanted everything their money could buy while there were still pockets of poverty in the land, and who offered certain reasons why it was right for them to do so. He went after all who were at ease in Zion while there were such inequities. He called the gentle ladies of Samaria (an 8th Century kind of "suburbia") "Bashan Cows" for demanding luxuries from their husbands while the poor went without necessities (4:1). He scored the men who stretched on ivory couches in Samaria but were not grieved over the rupture of Joseph (6:1, 4-7). By every wilful perpetuation of schism in society, by every undercutting of brotherhood, they annulled the covenant with God.

Worst of all: there was no one to interpret the situation of Israel in its full seriousness. There was complacency almost past believing in a former military prowess. And there was no help coming from religion. The shrines were busy. People came and people went. They made their offerings. But it was all *quid pro quo*, for the sake of insuring continued prosperity. Provided the church was supported, one heard no rebuke. It offered no criticism and allowed none. Amos had to leave Bethel because, as the High Priest put it, it was "the king's sanctuary and a temple of the kingdom" (7:13). Never has such a forgetful, such a kept, church heard it better than from Amos:

> I do hate, I do despise your pilgrim feasts,
> I take no pleasure in your high holy days.
> Though you offer me burnt offerings and your meal offerings, I won't accept them;

and to the peace offerings of your fat animals I'll pay no heed.
Take away from me the noise of your songs;
to the melody of your harps I'm not listening.
But—let justice roll down like waters and righteousness as an ever-flowing stream (5:21-24).

In a society which needed criticism desperately but in which the very source of criticism had dried up, there was the sickness unto death. And Amos dutifully pronounced the doom. The plumb-line hung beside the jerry-built wall (7:7-9). Israel would be left "the crumbs of a lion's meal"—two legs or a piece of an ear (3:12). The Day of the Lord—the great future for which Israel waited with confidence—would be "darkness and not light" (5:18). And the instrument of the Lord against her: "godless" Assyria! Here was something new in the prophecy of Amos: God could and would cast off the nation which had borne his name. Even the Kingdom of Israel was not quite identical with the Kingdom of God.

And yet everything Amos said was really very old. It came out of a well 500 years deep. He brought no new ethic, nor did he merely make an ethical attack. He was not a social revolutionary calling the masses to throw off their chains, nor simply a social reformer moved by the plight of the poor. The basis of his preaching was something out of the past which provided a going assumption of the people of Israel. Israel was brought out of Egypt, as she believed, by God for some new purpose in history; he had made a covenant with her; she was a chosen people. Amos takes this assumption completely seriously. As with all the prophets: first the indicative and then the imperative. By that very fact, so far from becoming complacent, let Israel be jarred forever from every complacency. For that very reason, so far from assuming her own purposes must triumph, let Israel know there is a will for history beyond her own. ". . . So the Lord, the God of hosts, will be with you—as you have said" (5:14).

Amos began by pronouncing a judgment on many nations, including Judah and Israel. Near the end he is still insisting there is no special exemption for Israel from the judgments which take place in history. " 'Are you not like the Ethiopians to me, O people of Israel?' says the Lord. 'Did I not bring up Israel from the land of Egypt—*and* the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?' " (9:7). At one place in the middle he reasons with deadly logic from the premise to an unthought conclusion:

You only have I chosen
of all the nations of the earth;
therefore I will punish you
for all your iniquities (3:1-2).

II

Our own nation was brought forth, as we are all taught to remember, in the fervor of a sense of chosenness. All the language of a new exodus over the Red Sea and a new land of promise weighted every Puritan tract. John Cotton preached to the emigration under Governor Winthrop on the text: "I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more" (2 Sam. 7:10). A century later President

Styles of Yale preached a sermon entitled "The United States Elevated to Glory and Honour" in which he described this nation as "God's American Israel."

To the south in Virginia the language was less Biblical and less orthodox, but the picture was the same: a break with old tyranny and a new beginning—now under "Nature's God" or Providence. A new economy of abundance would put an end to social vices, and a new democracy would prevent prejudice. Philip Freneau, a disciple of Jefferson and a student here at the College of New Jersey, wrote verse:

> Here independent power shall hold sway
> And public virtue warm the patriot's breast.
> No traces shall remain of tyranny
> And laws and patterns for the world beside be here enacted first.
> A new Jerusalem sent down from heaven shall grace our happy earth.

Arnold Guyot, who had a long and distinguished career on the faculty of Princeton, published a series of lectures under the title *The Earth and Man*. He described in technical fashion the treasures of our mountains and plains and waters and concluded that everything conspired to make this continent "the abode of the most vast and powerful association of men that has ever existed on the surface of the globe," to which the old nations of Europe "exhausted by difficulties of every kind . . . turn with hope their wearied eyes." At least part of this had come true when President Eisenhower announced that our country is "the mightiest power which God has yet seen fit to put upon his footstool."

When prosperity came to New England the Puritans first called it "special providence," "uncovenanted mercies." Then they reflected that "godliness is profitable in all things." In any case the sturdy Puritan virtues of self-discipline and hard work proved profitable in many things. The transition from Puritanism to Yankeeism was made, as someone has said, with lubricated ease. So Massachusetts said that virtue leads to prosperity, as Virginia said that prosperity leads to virtue. Psalms about the prosperity of the wicked and about suffering for righteousness' sake were skipped over in the North; and in the South they did not talk much about the basic Cain-and-Abel strife among men who are well fed. A slight American ambiguity still appears in many Thanksgiving Day proclamations: we are struck with awe and gratitude for uncovenanted mercies of field and stream and factory, and with the importance of acknowledging the fortuitous character of these blessings—*and* we are taken with the virtues, the ideals, and the piety of the American people who have received them.

The greatest shock and bewilderment of the Civil War was that it could happen here and that it could drag on so long. The country desperately needed a prophet—and found one not in a professional preacher, but in a man who was taken from hewing logs and who was a professional politician. He began with the premise. He was talking about Revolutionary battles in New Jersey when he called us "an almost chosen people": "There must have been something more than common that those men struggled for . . . something that held out a great promise to all the people of the world to all time to come." But he

made that premise a matter of faith and obedience. For Jefferson it was self-evident that all men are created equal. For Lincoln at Gettysburg this was a proposition to be tested—and there is in his word "testing" all the overtones of a test of faith, as Abraham or Job were tested in the Old Testament or as Israel was tested in the wilderness. This speech was full of the imagery of Baptism and renewal. An old man of sin was dying in agony that there might be a new birth of freedom under God. All the prophetic notes appear in the Second Inaugural Address. Neither the will of the South nor the will of the North should be judged supreme: "The Almighty has his own purposes." If this terrible war was a judgment on the inequity and rupture of brotherhood in American slavery, "shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a Living God always ascribe to him? . . . If God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled up by the bond-man's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid for by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'" He may even have advanced a step beyond Amos in the words which follow: "With malice toward none; with charity for all. . . ." While a kept-church in the South defended slavery, and a kept-church in the North prepared for vindictiveness without limit against the fraternal enemy, here for anyone who wanted it was the voice of a prophet affirming something old and saying something new.

III

It is a hundred years later and prophets are speaking again in the land. Not always in churches. Physicists point to the shaking foundations in a way no clergyman can. Earth scientists decry our plowing up the earth and our preparations for blowing it up; humorists complain about "contamination without representation." Poverty may be no disgrace in some places, but our economists say it is one here. It requires a great deal of ingenuity for 25% of the earth's people who possess 90% of its wealth to stay poor in their own eyes; yet we are determined by hook or by crook, by planned obsolescence and planned waste, to do so. Educators complain that we spend more on advertising to the American people than on educating them, more on acquiring a no-shift auto than on eliminating the two-shift school. Political leaders say we have gone soft, that we have lost the desire for excellence and innovation on which our survival, to say nothing of our world leadership, depend. The covenant-annulling racial schism, for which the entire nation already suffered once, hangs on. Theologians tell us our religion has become a servant rather than a critic of our ambitions and our comforts, of our intellectual and political and social sloth. And all this at a time when people all over the world—the vast majority of whom are poor, the vast majority of whom are uneducated, the vast majority of whom are not white—are rising to demand their birthright as human beings on the earth and as children of God.

Prophets are not always heeded. It is their lot to be resisted. But for us who keep Thanksgiving Day, and do so in

the fear of God, the God of Moses and the prophets, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and who mean something at least when we sing about the God of our fathers, these things must have an awesome sound. We must take note of this new birth of prophecy in our land. We must rejoice in it. We must suspect that our very life depends on it. And we must hear in it, or behind it, the great prophetic notes.

First: We dare not assume that our national purposes, in any case our uncriticized purposes, are identical with the purposes of God or are supreme. There is no reason to assume because our nation seems "almost chosen," because the Lord of history has been doing a new thing here, that we shall escape the judgments of history. We must not assume in the present world struggle that the "godly" nation must win and the "godless" nation must lose. There is no divine salvation for nations. We cannot escape history. We are in a large measure responsible for it.

Second: Nations, like churches, do not commonly admit error and they do not repent. Only citizens repent—but it is a good thing for the nation when they do. Repentance is the change of mind and heart by which God once more becomes the Lord. It means the costly death of many attitudes and practices which we have cherished in order that there may be a new life under God. It was through a death and resurrection that the New Israel was created; and by such repentance it is perpetually renewed.

Herein—let us say this very clearly for on it everything depends—herein lies the finest sense of Providence. Providence is not, and never really was, a matter of fact. It is a matter of the most venturesome faith. Providence does not mean that with the help of God everything will come to a good end. There are many things which come to a bad end. But faith in Providence finally is this: that in prosperity and adversity, in hope fulfilled and hope denied, in a time of peace and a time of war, and in a time of rumors of wars when "men's hearts fail them for fear and with foreboding of what is coming on the earth," even then (and especially then), we can boast that nothing is able to separate us from the love of God or frustrate the chief purpose of our lives. Here is a firm sense in which *all* things work together for good to those who love God. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? . . . No, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us. For I am sure that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8:28, 38-39). Those last words are important. Saint Paul knew what it is that destroys our faith in Providence: not our suffering but our separation from God's purposes. The only way to overcome this separation is the way of his forgiveness and grace, established in Jesus Christ who carried our rejection of those purposes all the way to death in God's name, that he might stay with us and we might turn to him. Faith in Providence and the forgiveness of sins are not two different things: they are one and the same thing. If Amos is the

best commentary on the "people of God" passages in Deuteronomy, then Saint Paul is the best commentary on the lilies and birds passage in the Sermon on the Mount.

Be like a bird
who, pausing in her flight
awhile on boughs too slight,
Feels them give way beneath her
and yet sings—
Knowing that she has wings!

Third: The prophetic note of hope. Amos concludes his words with a bright and warm vision of repaired breeches and a new society. So may we. By a strange alchemy, people who are freed by a living faith from illusions about the state become most important for it. They are salt and light and leaven; and while they are, the sickness is not to death. Only people who are attached to things can be threatened, made to goose-step, to stand idly by while their freedoms are stoned to death. People who belong to God and to nothing else supremely are forever free and forever brave. They are free to look at problems squarely, without complacency and without despair. They bring to society what a free society needs most of all, not only loyalty but criticism—a critical loyalty and a loyal criticism. They are most respectful of all social order and most ready to reform it. They know the corruptibility of all social forms and have a vision of a cleansed society. All the while they are most grateful for the nation; there is One for them to be grateful *to*. They know the senses in which we have all things from God—not only the good earth but the good fruits of the earth and the good fruits of human toil, and good government, and good hopes for the peoples of the world. In Christ we have all things—literally!

That, clearly, is not a premise to be assumed. It is a proposition to be tested. If that is what Thanksgiving means, then we may keep our "Pilgrim feasts" with divine approval and a merry heart!

ARCHITECTURAL IMPLICATIONS OF RECENT TRENDS IN REFORMED LITURGY

Conrad H. Massa

The church architect is in a unique, although not necessarily enviable position. When he comes into his initial contact with that diverse group of individuals known as a church building committee, he may find that they, together with their minister, have already reached certain decisions as to the kind of structure they want. They have carefully acquired one acre of land for which they wish the architect to design a single story structure of some 40,000 square feet—with a parking lot, of course! They give him a budget of $150,000 with which to work. With three strikes already against him, the architect exercises all of his ingenuity to come up with a possible structure which is immediately rejected by the committee as inadequate. Then they proceed to make another $150,000 worth of additions and changes, and are appalled when the architect tactfully suggests that it may now be difficult to stay within the original budget!

What we must all recognize, of course, is that behind this otherwise ludicrous procedure there is the unfortunate misunderstanding on the part of so many as to what is really the valid starting point for a church building. It is understandable that cost and land space should loom as such large factors in the minds of a building committee. They have to face the serious responsibilities of Christian stewardship. The money they will spend has to be given, and will yet have to be given through the sacrifices of many people for the next five, ten, or even fifteen years. It is a proper exercise of their Christian stewardship that they should want the most for their money.

But that is the issue! What is "the most for their money"? If they think solely in quantitative terms, so many dollars to spend to get so many cubic feet of space, so many square feet of floor, space to park so many cars, they may squeeze out the maximum square and cubic footage—and still have an inadequate building. Inadequate for the use for which it should have been designed primarily! Designing for quantitative space, while it has its problems, is relatively easier than designing for qualitative space. It is made easier by the fact that we are all able to add up dollars and to comprehend a number of square feet. We have some measurement for what we are getting when we buy quantitatively. But what are we getting when we buy qualitatively? How do you measure "per something" the value of a building which says what it ought to say and functions as it ought to function? The only such measure we have, of course, is our knowledge of what it is that we want our building to say, and our knowledge of what it is for which we want our building to function. Both of these are still matters on which our church building committees and ministers need a great deal of further education. This is a good thing. It is always good when Christians are forced

to think deeply about their faith in order to be able better to articulate that faith, whether it is to be articulated in a sermon, in social action, or in the building of a new place in which to worship.

Now one can assume that all of us are convinced of at least one aspect of this problem: we must build our churches from the inside out. A church building must say what we want to say so that what we believe is reflected in the building we put up. Theology is basic to church design. At this conference, we want to take the next step, and to look at what it is for which we want our church building to function. When we turn to this aspect of the problem, we are *not* turning our backs on theology. We are not depreciating or ignoring the fact that our building must still reflect what we believe. What we *are* doing, is to emphasize the truth that our belief is not dead, that theology is not a static thing. True, our theology takes a somewhat static form in creeds and confessions—and the Reformed branch of Protestantism has its confessions and creeds. But our theology also has its dynamic aspect. Theology is dynamic when it impels a church congregation into the evangelization of men and women in its community, into an ecumenical missionary concern which leaves no nation on earth untouched by the Gospel of Jesus Christ, into a social action project which dares to eliminate some entrenched social or cultural evil.

But there is another time when theology is dynamic, a time which occurs every week in the life of every congregation! It occurs when the congregation gathers to worship God. This is the action which we identify by the term "liturgy." For the "liturgy" of Reformed Protestantism is its theology in the action of worship. I emphasize this particularly because Reformed Protestantism has always been known to be heavily theological, and usually this has meant heavily weighted on the intellectual side. Historically, therefore, liturgy —which always gets wrongly confused with ritual—has been frowned upon in post-reformation centuries. But it was not frowned upon by the Reformers themselves, who realized that the liturgy of the Church was the working out of its theology in the activity of corporate worship.

One of John Calvin's first concerns, for example, when he became pastor of the small group of French exiles who had found a receptive home in Strasbourg, was to get a service book in French for his people. When he was recalled to Geneva, another such service book was published within the first year he was there. Not all of Calvin's wishes for the worship of the churches carried with the magistrates of the city of Geneva who wished to "simplify" the rite as much as possible. So Calvin never got the weekly observance of the sacrament which he desired. But he did insist upon, and got, an ordered sequence for the corporate act of worship which was theologically determined and theologically expressive. Even though Calvin was disappointed in not being able to have weekly observance of the sacrament, the same order, structure, and content of the eucharistic service of worship were retained for every service with the exception, only, of those parts which directly belonged to the act of communion. Thus, the liturgical expression of Reformed theology was to have essentially the same pattern for every

service whether the sacrament was to be celebrated or not.

Now it would be unfruitful here to enter into any discussion of detailed orders of service according to the Reformed understanding and pattern. Any interested minister or architect can find these in published form. Moreover, because of the freedom allowed in this area by most Reformed Churches, there is always some, and sometimes extensive, variation in the form a particular congregation will use. It must be noted, however, that there is a deep stirring in the churches of the Reformed tradition, that some like the United Presbyterian Church are now in the process of revising their constitutional standards and /or directories of worship. Certainly this procedure will continue; and it always takes quite a while for such changes to become general. It must be noted, as well, that this new thinking about worship is not merely being pushed from the top down. It is the local congregation which, usually as it sets about to build a new church or radically to redesign an old one, is forced to think about what it really wants and *needs* in a building. It is then that such a congregation's representatives may turn for help to many sources —some good, some not-so-good.

The thinking of Reformed Protestantism about its worship has been stimulated from at least three sources. First, historical research in the area of worship has made us aware of patterns of worship in the early Church. Secondly, biblical and theological studies have given a new ground to our concepts of worship. Thirdly, the ecumenical movement, with its resultant contact with other communions, has forced us to reconsider our own liturgy.

This being so, if details of orders are still in the process of change, and will always vary to some extent anyway, if the rethinking of worship is continuing under the stimulation of these various influences, is there *now* any solid ground of liturgical principles, in the contemporary trend of Reformed worship, upon which the architect can build? Yes, there is! And it is these principles with certain of their implications for the Reformed liturgy which I believe we can most fruitfully examine now.

In 1954 a very stimulating book was published by Richard Paquier, pastor of Saint Saphorin on the shore of Lake Geneva. This work has given a great impetus to Reformed thinking in Switzerland and France. It is to be hoped that it will become more influential here. Whether this should come about or not, however, Paquier does a good job of clarifying certain aspects of our current American Reformed thinking on worship. In this work, *Traité de Liturgique*, Paquier reminds us of our great Reformed theological emphasis on the sovereignty of God and its two basic aspects which are particularly crucial for worship—and, I may underscore, for the architectural expression of Reformed theology and the architectural setting of the Reformed liturgy. The sovereign God has taken the initiative! How? First, in the Incarnation, and secondly, in calling out a people unto himself! These are the two theological realities which must give shape to Reformed liturgy: the Incarnation and the corporate nature of the Church as the "called-out assembly."

Now what are the liturgical principles by which these theological realities are given expression in the art

of worship? For Paquier (and I would suggest that for contemporary Reformed thinking this is the direction in which we will be moving more and more) the theological fact of the Incarnation gives rise to the liturgical principle that Reformed worship is to be "incarnate spirituality." Just as the Incarnation is the ultimate expression of God in time and space, so the worship of the Church must of necessity be the expression of its faith in time and space. As Paquier puts it, "Corporeity, with sensibility and its essential reference to space and time, conditions the religious life as completely as the other phases of human activity" (p. 84). D. H. Hislop in the Kerr Lectures of 1933, *Our Heritage in Public Worship*, said "in the architecture and the content of a service we may not omit the fact that man's bodily life, and his contact with physical things must be given a place" (p. 53). But Paquier would want it insisted upon that the theological reality behind this observation is the fact of the Incarnation—the fact that God has come and does come to encounter men through the media of time and space.

Now this means, then, that in Reformed worship architectural expression and support must be given to the liturgical affirmation of the "real presence" of Christ in worship. John Calvin identified the Church as being wherever the Word of God is truly preached and heard and the Sacraments duly administered. Both the Word and the Sacraments, in Reformed theology, are aspects of the presence of Christ. In the true preaching and hearing of the Word of God, Christ personally confronts men and women through the preacher. In the due administration of the Sacraments there is the "real, spiritual presence" of the Lord. "Real" because we affirm the objective presence of the Lord in worship and not a mere subjectivism. But to avoid giving the impression that "real" means "material" and the Roman error of transubstantiation, we affirm that this is a "spiritual" presence. This "spiritual" presence is a "real" presence—it is an objective, nonmaterial presence.

In these essentials of Reformed worship, the Word and Sacraments, therefore, we affirm that a dialogue and a communion with a living God take place; or, in other words, that the spiritual indeed becomes incarnate in the sense that God again enters into living fellowship with His people through the media of time and space. The most significant aspect of this first liturgical principle, the principle of "incarnate spirituality," as far as architecture is concerned, is that the architectural expression of this must come by means of contemporary materials and methods and design which give architectural voice to the *contemporary* presence of the living God. Otto Spaeth pointed up this truth when he wrote:

> It seems to me that the first requirement of a church or temple today is that it be of today, contemporary, a structure embracing the total life of the parishioner. That parishioner drives a streamlined car to work in an office or factory where everything has been designed for maximum efficiency and comfort. He travels in streamlined trains and jet-propelled planes. Yet every Sunday he is asked to hurl himself back centuries to say his prayers in the pious gloom of a Gothic or Romanesque past. The clear implication is that God does

> not exist today; He is made out to be a senile old gentleman dwelling among the antiques of His residence, one whom we visit each week out of sentiment and then forget since He obviously has no relation to the normal part of our lives (p. 38, "Worship and the Arts" in Shear, *Religious Buildings Today*. Dodge, New York, 1957).

Now I realize that this may be overstated. Drawn to its logical conclusion, it would say that men cannot truly worship God today in churches which were built fifty, a hundred, or more years ago—a thing which is manifestly untrue. Yet, it is perhaps valid to say that such men worship despite the architecture rather than with its help. Certainly, a thoughtfully constructed church not only expresses what we believe, but it can and should help teach us what we *ought* to believe! In this sense as "incarnate spirituality" the church is intimately a part of Reformed liturgy. I may be more than a little radical in ecclesiastical circles, but I would contend that we of the Reformed tradition have no right today to build either Gothic cathedrals or 19th century auditoriums! Nor for that matter should we unthinkingly be dividing our chancels and constructing a modern Georgian without going into the whole matter very deeply. No one is more conscious than I that the uneasiness experienced by many church building committees about contemporary design, is that they simply do not want to think that God is that contemporary! But the Incarnation says that he is nothing less!

One would have to admit that there are some cautions to be raised even in this affirmation of the necessity for contemporary design. The concept of Incarnation can be carried too far! The desire to have the congregation aware that it worships in the context of modern life may be overdone and the balance of the sovereignty of God lost. Recently I worshipped in a church which has many commendable features, theologically and architecturally speaking. However it has made a rather unfortunate use of glass walls. As one sits in a pew he certainly has the feeling of contiguity with the world outside—a good idea within limits. In this case the worshipers on one side, particularly, looked out upon the church parking lot, which is a part of our modern life. However, although I have fairly good powers of concentration and a reasonable amount of religious devotion, I must confess that I found it difficult to worship in a parking lot, which was where I felt myself to be; particularly since the full schedule of the church meant that people were arriving and departing during the time the service of worship was being conducted.

I do not believe that had the parking lot been a golf course it would have made things any easier—aesthetically perhaps, but that would have had its own problems. (You see I am not of the school of those who find God somewhere between the 1st and the 18th holes on a Sunday morning!) Nor would a woods and a running brook or anything else do the job. In short, just using glass walls may simply do away with the valid and necessary distinction between God and his creation. The liturgical principle of "incarnate spirituality" has this other side—that God uses the media of time and space, but he is not identical with them or inseparable from them. The same fact needs to be

kept in mind about the use of flowers in the church, for example. As Paquier warns, the church must never smack of either a hothouse or a botanical garden —and for this same reason. In short, then, this first Reformed liturgical principle of "incarnate spirituality" says that the church building must reflect the truth that a living God encounters contemporary man in dialogue and in fellowship. The architecture of a Reformed Church should "breathe," have a sense of life, of "personality" about it. A building will not have this merely because it uses modern materials and design—but it must have this if it is to be a fit setting for Reformed worship, a "building that works as a place for liturgy."

The second theological reality which has given shape to Reformed liturgy, as Paquier sees it, is the corporate nature of the Church as the "called-out assembly" of God's people. We should note that Calvin's understanding of the Church reflects very definitely this same corporate nature of the Church. The Church is where the Word is truly preached and heard, and the due administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper includes participation of the whole congregation in receiving *both* the bread and the wine. Just so, the proper administration of baptism requires congregational participation in this corporate concern. Here must come our main objection against Gothic architecture—it is built for the drama of the Mass, not for participation in hearing the Word and receiving the full communion. Here, on the other hand, is equal objection to the 19th century auditorium church building which made the worshiper more of a spectator and auditor than a participant.

In a building which has been designed for the Reformed liturgy, no worshiper should be able to feel physically detached from what is taking place. There can be no "spectators" in this worship —we would have to watch very closely any use of galleries and balconies so that these do not become the means of separating the worshiper, not simply physically, but mentally and emotionally, from participation in the corporate worship. There must not be any "bleachers" in the Reformed Church, we want the congregation down on the ballfield! In his monumental book, *The Arts and the Art of Criticism*, Theodore M. Greene has this significant paragraph about architecture in general:

> "Architecture, then, is more essentially a social art than are any of the other major arts. . . . The secondary raw material of architecture is therefore to an unusual extent social in character; the human needs to be satisfied are social, and so are the emotive-conative states awaiting architectural expression (p. 78)."

There are, of course, buildings which are deliberately designed to give a sense of separation from others because this is one of the emotive-conative states which the function of the building as, perhaps, an office building, or a medical group building requires. Very definitely, however, the emotive-conative state to be given architectural expression in a building designed for Reformed liturgy is the state of active participation in a corporate activity.

Congregational singing of hymns was one of the remarkable changes which the reformers brought about. Hymns are a permanent part of our liturgical framework. A church of the Reformed

tradition has no need, therefore, for a divided chancel with choir stalls. The choir is to lead the congregation—not perform for it! The choir is much more appropriately placed in a rear gallery or at the rear of the nave for this purpose. Although the movement is only beginning, I have already worshiped in more than one Presbyterian Church in which the congregation's function of singing the responses has been returned to it, and the choir merely leads, it does not substitute for the congregation. The fact of the matter is that a Reformed church building does not need and should not have a separate chancel at all, in any sense in which the chancel is a part of Gothic architecture, for example. The chancel implies the medieval separation and distinction of clergy and people which Reformed worship specifically denies. Especially should the communion table not be placed at the far end of a deep chancel where its very physical removal from the congregation makes it psychologically impossible for the people to think of themselves as a fellowship about the Lord's Table, and into the area of which the minister alone enters as if into some Protestant holy of holies!

At this point one must confess that it is the renewed interest in and recovery of the centrality of the eucharist in Reformed liturgy which has given stimulus to the use of the divided chancel which makes possible a center aisle focusing on a central communion table. This recovery of the importance of the Lord's Table in Reformed liturgy is a good thing for it recaptures the early church's emphasis in worship which became part of the Calvinistic emphasis as well. The communion table, which is to be as one liturgist has put it, "a table with legs on it," that is very definitely a *table* and not a medieval altar housing bones of some saint or martyr, is the central symbol of the fellowship of God's people in his living presence. For this reason it must be as close to the congregation as possible, and essentially on the same level as the congregation.

Richard Paquier has emphasized another of Calvin's uses of the communion table in Reformed liturgy by urging that it, and not the pulpit, be the place from which the minister offers prayers. Prayers from the pulpit, warns Paquier, become a kind of "preaching" to God. There is no reason, he suggests, why the minister must stay perched in the pulpit "like an egg in an eggcup." The contemporary trend in Reformed liturgy is already well on the way to getting the minister out of the pulpit and into a greater use of the table for prayers on this physical level of the congregation. The significance of the minister's movement onto the physical level of the congregation for more and more portions of the liturgy must be taken into serious account in modern architectural expressions of the Reformed liturgy. There must be an architectural sense of both vertical movement between God and his people, and horizontal movement between minister and congregation—and the world outside.

Of basic importance in the Reformed celebration of the sacraments is not the bread or cup of the communion or the water of baptism. The sacraments consist essentially in the action which takes place. It is the breaking of the bread, the giving and receiving of the elements, the washing with the baptismal water which are the significant factors. For these actions every architectural possi-

bility ought to be used to give expression to the vertical and horizontal movements which are the essential nature of the sacraments. Usually, in Reformed worship, the worshiper receives the communion elements while seated in his pew, but he receives them from elders who have received them at the table from the minister. The action at the table must not only be visible to the congregation, but they must be able to realize their corporate unity with minister and elders.

All of this recovery of the importance of the table in Reformed liturgy has been a very necessary corrective to the one-sided centrality of preaching and the unfortunate obtrusiveness of the preacher which has distorted Reformed liturgical expression for far too long a time. One regrets only that this recovery of the importance of the table has been gained by a too hasty and ill-considered return to the divided chancel. We have already emphasized that Reformed liturgy is built around Word and Sacraments, not chiefly one or the other, but *both!* The table is theologically and liturgically central along with the Word not in place of it. The divided chancel has two additional disadvantages, therefore, to those already mentioned in regard to choir and clergy. First, it separates the pulpit from the Bible by incorporating a lectern to give balance. There is an unfortunate psychological impact from this physical separation of the written Word of God and its reading, from the place where that Word is to be expounded in its preaching. One pulpit, with the Bible on it is, one would suggest, truer to what we wish to express in the liturgy. Secondly, the divided chancel with the table always dead center tends to be just that—a "dead" center, which is exactly what it is not supposed to symbolize. If the places of the Word and Sacraments are *together* liturgically central, why is it not possible to give an architectural expression to first, their essential "togetherness" theologically and liturgically speaking, and secondly, to their individual centrality as each one becomes, in its turn, the focus of the liturgical action. The architect of a church in the Reformed tradition has, I thus suggest, absolute freedom in the placing of the three essential furnishings for the Reformed liturgy: the pulpit, the communion table, and the baptismal font, so long as he recognizes their essential togetherness and their individual centrality in the course of the liturgical action. He is thus free to begin with these to create the setting in which the Reformed liturgy can work according to its principles of "incarnate spirituality" and the "corporate nature of the Church" through the Word and the Sacraments.

One would close with only this plea that the full reality of the meaning of "incarnate spirituality" be probed. Must our crosses be of gold or finely polished wood? Must we have only pastel walls and everything else which exudes peace and breathes comfort? There was a certain harsh reality about the Incarnation. There is a severity about a Gospel which speaks of crucifixion. Our architecture must "incarnate" the spiritual tension which is inherent in any liturgical order through which men are in dialogue and fellowship with their Creator and Redeemer. A Cross which overshadows our worship as it emerges from the very structure of the place in which we worship would be far more meaningful than one which glitters in the center of a table. And yet the cross must not over-

shadow the life-affirming, life-renewing promise that eternal life is a quality of life which the Christian enjoys here and now! The supreme affirmation of the Christian Gospel is not the tension, not the suffering Jesus on his Cross, not death, but life, Resurrection, the living Christ's presence among his people. The church architect's vocation thus gives him the supreme privilege of creating with ultimately perishable stone and wood and glass and steel a setting for the imperishable fellowship of a living God with his people.

REVIEW–ARTICLE ON COMMUNISM AND THE CHURCHES

Edward A. Dowey, Jr.

The bad old days of McCarthy, Matthews, Poling, Philbrick, and other fellow travelers of fanaticism make up only a part of Ralph Lord Roy's new book on *Communism and the Churches* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1960. $7.50)—a part to which many will turn first, hunting sensationalism. The great value, however, of this balanced study by a gifted researcher and fascinating writer, is that it begins at the beginning and tells the whole story in excellent perspective.

Mr. Roy, whose earlier volume, *Apostles of Discord*, was a study of right wing disruptive groups in Protestantism, again approaches his material on the level of sober, candid journalism, with a minimum of philosophizing, but with his own views clearly expressed. "Implicit in this study is the conviction that Communism is hostile to the ideals of both religion and American democracy." His introductory chapter on the problem of handling this delicate material so as to deal only with facts is a fine case study for writers of controversy, reluctant or otherwise. Here he presents a check list of issues by which true followers of the Communist party line have been identifiable in past years and offers some valuable cautions, usable by both Left and Right, about association and affiliation as clues to a given man's point of view.

The author has a fine sense for the irony that while Marxist Communists are the outspoken foes of religion, "more damage has perhaps been done to America's churches by the noisiest antagonists of Communism." At the same time, "the anti-Communist crusade of the early fifties, however irresponsible in many of its methods, was based on more than myth. There was a genuine need to awaken millions of Americans to the actual nature of the Communist movement." He estimates that there were only about one per cent of the 500,000 ordained clergy who have lived in the United States since 1930 (85 per cent of them Protestants) "who have been 'affiliated' in any way whatsoever" with Communist efforts. He estimates that "possibly as few as fifty, perhaps as many as two hundred" ever joined the Communist party. "Today, perhaps twenty-five of this number remain—or approximately seven one-thousandths of one per cent of American ministers, and most of these are not serving pulpits."

The Bolshevik revolution of 1917 and the reactions to it among American religious leaders form the beginning of this account. It is then carried through the era of open enmity between Communism and all religion until "The Communists Discover the Churches" and begin to capitalize (if that word may be used here) on Christian ideal-

ism for Soviet purposes. Here the author's story begins in earnest. He traces it mostly in historical order, but with numerous, deftly handled excurses and recapitulations. It would be gratuitous to summarize this 500-page book with its many hundred footnotes, especially since the author himself is so cautious about general statement. But some impressions may be a spur to first hand reading by others.

Front organizations seem to have been the most influential instruments of the Communist movement for infiltrating American religious life. Especially impressive to this reader was the account of the subtle approaches to the Negroes and their church leaders, which generally failed, despite the legitimate outrage of the Negro community aroused by the Scottsboro case, and by their second class status in American life. Numerous committees and action groups with altruistic titles were either Communist organized or were taken over later by Communists to further purposes alien to many of their members and supporters. Tricky approaches and sheer dishonesty often made use of people who had no knowledge of the hidden Communist connections of some of these organizations. It was (and, one hopes, still is!) quite to be expected that Christian ministers would be "Against War and Fascism" as well as against all forms of social injustice and tyranny. But many ministers were quite careless in giving their names to causes and did in fact become dupes. On the other hand, as Mr. Roy points out, the resultant determination of many ministers since that time to lend their names to no movements at all and to be squeamish about good causes may in the long run be a serious blow to the effectiveness of the churches in promoting social progress.

Great sensitivity is shown by the author in recounting the various kinds of relation that clergy, church groups, and religious periodicals had with fronts and non-fronts. He devotes separate chapters to the Roman Catholic, the Methodist, the Episcopal, and the Armenian churches, and to the Unitarians. Also special sections are allotted to the more prominent of the left wing religious leaders such as Harry Ward, Hewlett Johnson, Jack McMichael, Kenneth Leslie, Claude Williams, Joseph Fletcher, and others. Mr. Roy spends little space on the private drama of these lives, but he treats each in individual terms and gives the impression that he spared nothing in seeking documentation and sometimes personal contact. He also gave special care to the study of the "Saga of J. B." Matthews and the story of Herbert Philbrick. The present writer was surprised at the influence attributed to the Red Dean: "His opinions, however warped, had a far greater impact upon the clergy than anything Earl Browder, William Z. Foster, or the *Daily Worker* might have said. Herein rested the Dean's major contribution to the Communist cause."

Readers of the PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN will probably have a special interest, as has the present writer, in the treatment of the "Letter to Presbyterians" of 1953 and its author Dr. John A. Mackay. *Presbyterian Life* in a review of this book (December 1, 1960, pp. 27-28) pointedly chose not even to mention that the document and its author are dealt with by Mr. Roy. But Dr. Mackay's bout with J. B. Matthews and the "Letter" which he wrote play a pivotal role in the chapter called

"The Churches Take the Offensive." The spearhead of the offensive, according to the author, was Bishop Oxnam's self-arranged appearance before the Committee on Un-American Activities. Also included here are the events surrounding Josef Hromadka's visit to the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches and the travels of a group of American churchmen to Russia. It should be remembered that the "Letter to Presbyterians" had the influence in America which Mr. Roy cites from several sources, and also that it was widely commented upon abroad. Paris' *Le Monde* ran the full text in two installments. Further it should not be forgotten that this document was subjected to a hoax, exploded but still unrepented of, by Dr. Dan Poling and the *Saturday Evening Post.* The *Post* printed and stood by Poling's outrageous claim that the Letter contained the "exact sentiment" and "exact language" of two issues of the *Cominform Journal.* This slander, implying that Dr. Mackay absorbed and even copied from Red documents, has never been retracted by either Poling or the *Post,* although the former managed quietly to forget the whole matter in his recent autobiography. The present writer investigated these charges in detail at the time (*Christianity and Crisis,* October 4, 1954), was rebuffed by Dr. Poling and Robert Fuoss of the *Post* in an effort to set the matter straight, then stood by while the aging clergyman frantically faked his case in the *Christian Herald* (August, 1954) with more detailed and quite phony documentation. One hopes that the denomination and its press will both remember and profit by the memory of their courage in the matter of the Letter. The Church must continue to speak with both caution and courage and must not be deterred by the prospect of controversy, especially in the present time when some new form of the Communist threat may at any time call forth another round of witch hunting.

The final incident in the book is, of course, the Air Force Manual scare of just one year ago. In this connection, the author writes that "the notion that America's churches and religious leaders are significantly influenced by Communists or Communist sympathizers is absurd." Nonetheless, he shows the danger of irresponsible charges, because "millions of Americans do not yet appreciate the basic differences between the intelligent, independent thinking of the Oxnams and the Mackays, on the one hand, over and against the consistent pro-Soviet views of the Wards and the Spoffords on the other."

This volume is one of a series on *Communism in American Life,* edited by Professor Clinton Rossiter. It is certainly the one for ministers to buy, despite the high price. It should clear up the record of the recent past, but even more, it should contribute to a future of social concern equipped equally with courage and realism.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Book of Jeremiah—The Lamentations of Jeremiah, by Howard Tillman Kuist. (*The Layman's Bible Commentary,* vol. 12.) John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1960. Pp. 148. $2.00.

A good commentary on Jeremiah is difficult to write, as the scarcity of such in English suggests. Yet there is no personality in the Old Testament more to be recommended to our acquaintance, and no book in the Old Testament which can be more stimulating and helpful for personal religion. Writing on Jeremiah for *The Layman's Bible Commentary* is a challenge to the best of academic and personal power.

This book comes from a background of thirty years of teaching Jeremiah by Princeton Seminary's distinguished Professor of Biblical Theology and English Bible, and reflects the author's long association and intimate acquaintance with the great prophet. Meeting Jeremiah can be a thrilling experience, and for its size and its circle of readers there is no better guide to that adventure than this commentary.

The Layman's Bible Commentary is intended to be "a concise non-technical guide for the layman in personal study of his own Bible." The plan in the series therefore practically excludes handling all the problems in so large a book as Jeremiah. Treatment of textual difficulties, clarification of geographical and historical details, and comment upon introductory problems have been kept to a minimum. The Revised Standard Version, which is the basic text used throughout the series, has not been printed in the book. The commentary does not deal with the text verse by verse, but rather summarizes the substance of each section or paragraph in the text.

However, the reader must admire the author's care and judgment in writing a both scientifically sound and practically lucid exposition of the text, and his accomplishment of clarifying in the course of the exposition so many matters of technical or informational importance.

In the introduction Dr. Kuist sketches the career and times of Jeremiah, the very interesting stages in the making of the book of Jeremiah, and the message of the book. The structure of the book is analyzed in some detail, and to technical scholarship as well as to the average reader this little volume offers helpful suggestions to one of the most perplexing of critical problems in Jeremiah study: the rationale in the organization of the book, with its bewildering disregard for chronological sequence.

One of the best features of this commentary is its realistic appraisal of the man Jeremiah; the author is willing to treat the prophet as a complicated *person,* with life-size problems and lifelike reactions. Such an approach does not obscure, but rather deepens and illuminates our understanding of Jeremiah, and satisfies the Bible student who is anxious for Old Testament exposition which is relevant to his own complicated life.

The commentary on Lamentations is brief, in proportion to the general plan of the series, but manages to paint a clear picture of the form, background, and message of this book.

Wesley J. Fuerst

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEBRASKA

Dynamic Preaching, by James W. Clark. Fleming H. Revell Company, Westwood, N.J., 1960. Pp. 128. $2.50.

The scope of the book has been limited to three areas: the Glory, the Message, and the Dynamic of preaching. Though by no means new in its basic concepts, the author has discussed the nature and function of preaching in an interesting fashion.

In a day when many roles clamor for priority in the minister's time, Dr. Clark has presented a strong case for the primacy of preaching. He contends that the sermon is properly the replacement "of the Host in the Roman Mass, and the pulpit of the altar."

A strong pastoral spirit and understanding is reflected in the discussion of the preacher and his message. The preacher as a person is inseparably related to the message of the

pulpit. Due emphasis is placed upon preaching to the identifiable needs of people.

The final focus of the book is quite appropriately upon the devotional life of the minister. Dr. Clark has emphasized the devotional life as the most determinative factor in dynamic preaching. This is, perhaps, the most significant contribution of the book.

The book will make its contribution to two groups of ministers. It will be helpful to the immature who are in need of proper orientation to the ministry of the Word. Those who through the attrition of the years have lost the sense of mission and purpose for preaching will find the book rewarding.

The author has revealed a broad and rich acquaintance with his subject, though his brevity at some points may leave his readers desiring a more adequate and comprehensive treatment.

JOHN E. GARDNER

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MC KENZIE, TENNESSEE

Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul, compiled under the direction of Bruce M. Metzger. E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1960 (American publisher, Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan). Pp. xv + 183. $4.00.

When a card catalogue is turned into a book, it is not designed to fascinate the reader. Its usefulness to the student is the major objective, and in the example before us, this objective is fully realized. The utility of a bibliography depends mainly upon two factors: the range of materials covered, and the efficacy of the pattern of organization. On both counts this Index merits high praise.

First of all, a word about its coverage. Almost three thousand separate essays are listed. The essays have appeared in more than a hundred periodicals from their initial issue—which in some cases was more than a century ago—until 1957, or until the journal expired. Journals published in *fourteen* different languages have been included. Few will realize how much work was required of Dr. Metzger and twenty of his students in examining so much material. Only the most patient and painstaking scholar could contemplate such a task with anything short of dismay. All the more amazing, then, is the announcement that this is but the first of six *New Testament Tools and Studies* to be edited by Professor Metzger. Such a program is almost incredible! I say "almost" because personal acquaintance with the editor enables me to believe it.

Second, a word about the pattern of organization. There is good reason for most of the sectional divisions, as, for example, a section on bibliographical essays and one on the history of Pauline interpretation. With one exception the section of biographical studies is well arranged. This exception is the use of a pigeon-hole marked "Miscellaneous Studies" which is large enough for several eagles. More than one hundred and twenty essays are located here, many of which would be more accessible if located elsewhere, or located in new and smaller groups to facilitate quick reference. Least convincing in organization is the section of essays dealing with theological topics. Logical order is here surrendered to alphabetical order, e.g. "Paul on the Place of Women" is set between "Paul and Jesus" and "Righteousness of God." Moreover, the items listed under the caption "General" are too numerous and too heterogeneous to provide easy access.

The most helpful—and the longest section—deals with exegetical studies, which are arranged seriatim by chapter and verse. Although the cross-referencing system could be more complete, the scholar will readily find here many essays on a given passage which otherwise would escape his notice. Incidentally, the Index invites one to ponder the curious obsessions of scholarship during the past century. Why, for instance, do more than half of the essays on Philippians deal with 2:5-11? Why do all but three of the exegetical essays on II Thessalonians deal with 2:1-12? Why are no fewer than twenty-five essays devoted to one verse in Galatians (3:20)?

All praise to the editor and his assistants. Their work will be amply vindicated by the use which will be made of it by hundreds of students during coming decades.

PAUL S. MINEAR

YALE UNIVERSITY
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

Word and Sacrament, A Preface to Preaching and Worship, by Donald Macleod. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1960. Pp. 176. $3.50.

One of the burning questions in the Church today is public worship. What is its meaning? What form should be prescribed, if any? Is preaching to be considered worship or an adjunct to worship? How does the minister relate his theology of worship to his leadership of worship, and both to his theology of preaching?

As Professor in the Department of Worship and Preaching at Princeton Theological Seminary, Donald Macleod is well prepared to wrestle with such questions in this new volume, which should appeal to all ministers and to others interested in the worship of the Church.

The book is divided into four sections. In the first, preaching is discussed in terms of "communication" as well as "proclamation," with its integrity being found not only in the message but also in the method and the motive. These basic concerns are related to such contemporary problems as the *prima donna* whose congregation moves when he moves and the failure of the "religious revival" in America to make an appropriate impact upon our culture.

The second section contains a historical survey of public worship, indicating different movements which have contributed to our Reformed heritage and noting especially the strong influence of Puritanism on Protestant worship in this country. Against this background the author moves on to develop his main theme, that preaching finds its significance only in the context of a worship which is theologically oriented, psychologically conditioned, and in touch with life. Our aim is to secure *wholeness* in the act of worship, he says. Preaching is recognized as one of the acts of worship, which raises the question as to the appropriateness of the sub-title of the book which could suggest that preaching is an adjunct to worship.

An unusual feature of the book comes in the last section which contains four meditations and two sermons, emphasizing the importance of understanding worship from a theological and Biblical point of view and illustrating how the pulpit can guide the pew toward a greater appreciation of its responsibility in public worship.

Clarity and vitality characterize the author's style, and interest in reading is stimulated by frequent references to the writings of men of such variety as Eusebius, Calvin, Hodge, Fosdick, Barth, Spurgeon, William Cowper, and Ezra Pound.

A normal reaction to the book is that the author tries to accomplish too much in so brief a space. He touches on vital issues without giving them adequate development. For example, in a keen way he raises the question of the popular desire for that kind of authority in the pulpit which will not disturb the *status quo.* Or again, the necessity of empathy in effective communication is opened up. The effect on this reviewer, however, was to whet his appetite for further thought and study and to be grateful for some fresh ideas with jagged edges.

WADE P. HUIE, JR.
COLUMBIA SEMINARY
DECATUR, GA.

Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman, edited by J. M. Myers, O. Reinherr, H. N. Bream. (Gettysburg Theological Studies No. 1.) Augustin, Locust Valley, N.Y., 1960. Pp. 224. $6.00.

This collection of essays is a heartfelt tribute to the memory of a revered teacher of Gettysburg Seminary, published seven years after his death, but while his memory is still green among his colleagues and former students. Upon one who did not know Dr. Alleman personally a strong impression is made of the powerful and permanent effect on the lives of multitudes of a rich and profoundly religious personality.

The volume is introduced by a short Appreciation, a reprinting of Dr. Alleman's "Devotional Studies Based on the Psalms," and a bibliography of his publications, which show him in his role as the believing and scholarly interpreter of the Bible to the Church. The eight essays which follow are, as is usual in such volumes, unrelated except by the general designation of Biblical studies,

divergent in viewpoint and interest, and of unequal importance.

Pride of place is given to what is unquestionably the *pièce de résistance* of the volume, *Die Faktizität der Geschichte im Biblischen Denken*, by Johannes Hempel of Göttingen. This carries forward the author's discussion of *Glaube, Mythos und Geschichte im AT* of 1953. Hempel is not concerned here with the relationship of Biblical faith to external history, but rather with the role and function of facts in the thinking of Biblical writers. The facts in question are not those of the physical environment nor of external events, but the facts of life as experienced in a human community. These are of three kinds—the fact of *rivalry*, of perpetual struggle for preeminence, not only between individuals and societies but even between Yahweh and the rulers and gods of the nations. Second, there is the fact of *failure* seen as failure before God's will, with its inevitable consequences. Third, there is the fact of the *turning*, returning, renewal, restoration, which is God's act. Hebrew thinking is not analytical, it does not concern itself with ideas, but is a reaction of the will to apprehended reality in what God has done and has commanded. Such a summary is a very inadequate suggestion of the compact, penetrating and powerful argument of Hempel's essay, with which Biblical scholars will have to reckon.

Space will permit only brief comments on the remaining contributions. George E. Mendenhall displays his customary erudition and independence in discussing "The Relation of the Individual to Political Society in Ancient Israel"; he derides the idea that individual personality was submerged in corporate personality, and stresses the importance of individuals in Biblical as contrasted with pagan religion. Henry S. Gehman discusses with scholarly thoroughness "Natural Law and the Old Testament," and concludes that the Law of God in the O.T. includes natural law but transcends it. Harold L. Creager and Elmer E. Flack offer careful exegetical studies on the Grace of God in Second Isaiah and in Biblical Thought in general. Charles T. Fritsch presents detailed linguistic evidence for his contention that the translator of the LXX of Isaiah "consciously changed many anthropomorphic expressions which were at variance with his concept of God." The reviewer wonders why, if this were the decisive reason for such changes, any such expressions were permitted to remain. In most cases the wish to render the meaning as simply as possible for Greek readers seems sufficient reason for the changes, though again the problem of inconsistency remains. Raymond T. Stamm is concerned to "Christianize Christian eschatology" by illuminating "Three Cardinal Ideas in the Gospel of John,"—"the continuing presence of the risen Jesus in his church," "the continuing task of the church," and "the continuing revelation of God through the spirit." Finally, J. M. Myers provides an admirably balanced discussion of the meaning and purpose of cultus in relation to Article XV of the Augsburg Confession.

The memory of H. C. Alleman is honored by the quality of these essays.

R. B. Y. Scott

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, N.J.

God, Man, and Satan. Patterns of Christian Thought and Life in Paradise Lost, Pilgrim's Progress, and the Great Theologians, by Roland Mushat Frye. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1960. Pp. x + 184. $3.75.

Those whose special privilege it was to listen to Dr. Frye delivering the Stone Lectures will find special delight in repeating that experience while reading them again in this volume. Often the audience felt a sense of frustration when their slowly moving mind was unable to follow the abundance of profound ideas which the speaker developed in his analysis of the two greatest works of Puritan poetry.

Dr. Frye points out rightly how amazingly *Paradise Lost* and *Pilgrim's Progress* supplement each other. Milton the humanist probes the very depths of human nature in its male and female bipolarity, and he reduces evil to its ultimate root, which is Satan's tempting man. Bunyan, the practical man, describes the life that issues from man's sinful nature by portraying a multitude of types of conduct. All of them have this in common that they are unaware by themselves of the

goal of human existence, but what differences of behavior and what confusing abundance of ways do they display! True, there is only one path that will eventually lead to the Celestial City, but how often even a true believer will be lured aside! Milton's work will in the first place appeal to the thoughtful Christian on account of the boldness with which he modifies the tenets of Puritan theology in the light of new and stimulating insights of amazing depth. Bunyan, on the other hand, is so rewarding because he shows that the rational dogmas of Orthodoxy are not as dry and abstract as they may appear, for they are integrations of the complex experience of the life of faith.

Of special interest is the way in which Dr. Frye combines the symbolism of the two poets with statements drawn from Protestant theologians of the sixteenth no less than the twentieth century. Modern man is so little accustomed to thinking in symbols that a good deal of the deeper meaning of the two poetical works would escape him completely unless some friendly guide such as Dr. Frye helped him to understand the hidden truth intimated by the symbolical narratives. And yet, one wonders, how far one could legitimately go in this method of illustrating the poet's thoughts by means of non-poetical statements. After all, it is not by chance that Milton and Bunyan wrote poetry when they wanted to present the profoundest ideas of the Christian faith. They felt that the mystery of God's work in Creation and Redemption could not be given adequate expression through the rational consistency of dogmatics. What Michelangelo sought to show by means of plastic art and Leonardo and Rembrandt through their paintings, the Englishmen attempted to make real in poetical works. One sometimes wonders whether ideas of Barth or Reinhold Niebuhr, and even of Calvin and Luther, far from illustrating the poet's thoughts, were not rather in need of being illustrated by the pictures of typical experiences described in *Paradise Lost* and *Pilgrim's Progress.*

Otto A. Piper

On the Authority of the Bible. Some recent Studies by Leonard Hodgson, C. F. Evans, John Burnaby, Gerhard Ebeling, and D. C. Nineham. S.P.C.K., London, 1960. Pp. 96. 8s. 6d.

The problem of Biblical authority has assumed increasing significance in the Church of England, and the Lambeth Conference of 1958 had the subject on its agenda. In order to keep the discussion going, the S.P.C.K. has now gathered a number of articles related to the subject and formerly published in periodicals. They are characteristic of a group of British theologians who have obviously felt the impact of Bultmann's thought, and who are therefore anxious to differentiate themselves both from Fundamentalism and from the new British school of Biblical Theology. While differing in details, the authors emphasize the inacurracy of the historical records in the Bible, the difficulty the human mind has in forming an adequate idea of God, the historical cleavage that separates us from the Biblical writers, and the obvious lack of unity found in the Scriptures and they plead for a readiness on the part of the modern reader of the Bible to endure the burden of insecurity resulting from these facts. Manifestly these problems are very much the same as those confronting any creedal church in the U.S.A. Nevertheless, the solutions offered differ considerably from what American theologians would suggest, and they are indicative of the historical sense of our British colleagues. They point out that the Gospels originated in the church, and this fact tempers both historical scepticism and philosophical agnosticism. There is great diversity, however, in the way the contributors to this volume implement that outlook. They vary from autonomous rationalism to an appeal to historical and ecclesiastical tradition. With the emphasis placed on the work of the interpreter they go far beyond the Roman Catholic view, in which Bible and Tradition are found in an indissoluble correlation.

These essays are not so much intended to provide a definitive answer to the problems raised by the historical criticism of the Bible as to arouse the church to the realization that it is impossible to acquiesce to solutions offered in former times for entirely different situations. To this reviewer it would seem, however, that they failed to differentiate sufficiently between the problem of historical

interpretation, which the Bible shares with other documents of the past, on the one hand, and the problem of revelation, on the other. The latter is unique for the Bible and independent of its age. Biblical authority is a religious problem resulting from the fact that substantially God and man have nothing in common, yet that there can be no assurance of salvation unless we can safely assume that a reliable and intelligible revelation of God is encountering us.

Otto A. Piper

Luther the Expositor. Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings, by Jaroslav Pelikan (Luther's Works, Companion Volume). Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1959. Pp. xiii + 286. $4.00.

This volume is intended to serve as a kind of general introduction to the monumental edition of Luther's Works in English which the Concordia Publishing House in St. Louis and the Muhlenberg Press in Philadelphia are jointly publishing. Dr. Pelikan, who is one of the ablest experts on Luther on this side of the Atlantic, has brilliantly succeeded in portraying the man and Christian Luther in his exegetical activity, when others might have been satisfied with extracting some dry rules of hermeneutics from his commentaries.

The book is divided into two parts, the first one discussing the principles of Luther's exegesis, and the second one describing Luther's practice as illustrated by his treatment of the New Testament passages dealing with the Lord's Supper. The author emphasizes the intimate relationship in which Luther stood with the exegetical and theological work of the past as well as with his contemporaries. The Reformer's remarkable originality has long been misinterpreted because the monk and professor was studied in isolation, whereas his greatness and originality resulted from his readiness to learn from others and to do justice to their views. Where he surpasses them is in his rediscovery of the fact that God is a God who speaks to people. This view separates Luther both from those who make the text of the Bible their supreme authority as also from those who from the vantage point of a given theology or philosophy take the Biblical writers to task. In his speaking, God reveals his grace to man; but by doing so he acts as man's Lord who demands respect for his Word. The fact that for Luther the Bible is centered in Christ is widely interpreted as meaning that by an intellectualistic exegesis the Bible is to be read as a textbook of Christology. But not only is Luther's Christ at work in Creation, too, no less than in the Passion, but the book which reveals him is also but a means of grace which enables the Church to proclaim the Word of God. Thus the Reformer sees in exegesis the way in which the believing Church interprets its own life as called forth by God.

The specimens of Luther's exegesis given in the second part of this work make it plain that Luther cannot simply be used as a model of Biblical interpretation. Contradictions, obscurities, and arbitrary views can easily be detected everywhere. Yet the reader will agree with Dr. Pelikan that in spite of them Luther towers high above ancient and modern exegetes because in an inimitable manner he is capable of transforming every word of the Biblical text into divine food for the faith.

Otto A. Piper

Animal and Man in Bible Lands, by F. S. Bodenheimer. E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1960. Pp. viii + 232. 36 Guilders.

The late Professor of Zoology in the Hebrew University in Jerusalem published this work originally in Hebrew in 1950. Shortly before his death in 1959 he issued his own English translation, which is listed by the Publisher as No. 10 in the *Collection de Travaux de l'Académie Internationale d'Histoire des Sciences*. The book offers a striking example of the manner in which the Bible attracts the attention of learned specialists to some particular aspect of the world it depicts. In this case a great scientist has been drawn by his interest in the history of biology to investigate the biological landscape of the Bible.

Among the new materials for study uncovered by excavation in the Middle East during the past quarter century are abundant animal remains. A study of this evidence

makes it possible to get a much clearer picture of the role of animals in the experience, service, and thought of men during the human occupation of Palestine. While Professor Bodenheimer claims only to have inaugurated a new beginning in this field of study, he has nevertheless made a distinct contribution to the history of culture in Bible lands by bringing together the findings of recent archaeology and the observations of the ancient oriental and classical sciences. The book, as a matter of fact, has unusual value as a compendium, in English, of Greek and Latin comments made by ancient authorities about the animal world. Extensive passages are quoted from a wide range of such authors as Aelianus, Aristotle, Artemidorus, Diodorus Siculus, Herodotus, Oppian of Apameia, Oppian of Cilicia, Pliny, Plutarch, Strabo, Xenophon, and others, together with explanatory comments about their observations. In the light of the newly acquired archaeological evidence it is now possible to achieve a much more reliable synthesis of former studies in this field in relation to Biblical interpretation and Dr. Bodenheimer has made an important step in this direction.

The scope of the present treatment is indicated by the main topics considered. First, the geological formation of Palestine is described, and its faunal history in the Tertiary and Pleistocene periods is followed by a study of the appearance of man in the Middle East. Second, Ancient Zoology in the Middle East is treated. Here the author draws heavily upon ancient eastern and classical authorities to compare their comments with the more recent evidence. Third, archaeological evidence from the Neolithic to the end of the Chalcolithic age (4500-3000 B.C.) concerning the animal and human world is presented. This is followed by a survey of conditions in Canaan during the Bronze and Iron Ages (3000-300 B.C.). Special attention is given here to the excavations at Gezer, Tell Beit Mirsim, Tell Taanach, Wadi Ghuzzeh, Beth-shan, Megiddo, and Samaria for evidence concerning animals. The astonishing progress of Palestinian archaeology today is indicated by the fact that during the decade which has elapsed since this work was originally published so much more evidence has been made available by the excavations at Jericho and elsewhere. A final chapter is devoted by Dr. Bodenheimer to a critical analysis of Sir James G. Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament* (3 volumes, 1919).

Readers of the PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN will recognize that the author has placed all students of the Bible greatly in his debt by putting into their hands a volume which has such significance as a source book of ancient culture, together with the more recent findings (up to 1950) of Palestinian archaeology on animal life in Bible lands.

HOWARD T. KUIST

The Bible Companion, edited by William Neil. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1960. Pp. xii + 468. $9.95.

The claim of this book to be a *complete* pictorial and reference guide to the people, places, events, background, and faith of the Bible is an exaggeration. It would be truer to the fact to say that it is designed to accompany intelligent reading of the *whole* Bible. Under the editorship of William Neil of the University of Nottingham, fourteen British, one Canadian, and two American scholars have contributed to the production of an extraordinary encyclopaedia for Biblical study. Their work consists of twenty-one chapters grouped into eight parts: The Background of the Bible, the Holy Land, the Scriptures (including the Apocrypha), the Faith of the Bible, the People and Places of the Bible, Art and Science in the Bible, the Social Structure in Biblical Times, the Story of the Bible.

In his Introduction the Editor explains that some parts are composed on a topical plan in ready-reference form for the purpose of giving specific information about people, places, events, or individual Bible books. Other parts consist of short articles which may be read consecutively when a survey of a field like that of archaeology, for instance, is desired. The book therefore is designed to serve either as a reference work or as an accompaniment to the reading of the Bible. In either case the text is written in a clear, attractive, non-technical manner by competent scholars. The double-column format and large pages, together with the lavish illustrations, make a most attractive book. There are six-

teen full-color plates, beside one hundred and fifty eight full-page black and white photographs of significant Biblical scenes or paintings. A selective Bibliography for further reading, besides an Index of names, places, and topics, enhances the usefulness of the book.

It is to be regretted that the cartography of *The Bible Companion* does not measure up to the high standard of excellence maintained in the book as a whole. The twenty flat, line-drawn maps are a very poor substitute for the admirable maps in color to be found in recently published Atlases. Two unfortunate errors have crept into the pictures. The picture of the Pool of Siloam on page 120 is taken from the wrong direction and therefore does not show the real exit of Hezekiah's tunnel as the footnote suggests. Plate 91 is not a picture of the ruins of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus, but of the so-called Library of Celsus. The site of the Temple of Artemis, identified by J. T. Wood in 1870, is more than a mile away from the site depicted in Plate 91. These errors may be corrected in future editions.

HOWARD T. KUIST

A Dictionary of Life in Bible Times, by W. Corswant. Oxford University Press, New York, 1960. Pp. 309. $6.50.

Among the modern aids available to the Bible reader or teacher this is certainly one of the most instructive. The new Historical Geographies and Atlases enable the reader to envisage the physical background of the Bible. Modern archaeology makes it possible for him to reconstruct shadowy aspects of its history more accurately. This book introduces him to the whole range of human experience and customs within which the characters of Bible antiquity moved: their home life, their work and trade, arts and sciences, political, civil and military affairs, religious practices, along with the surrounding animal world, plants and minerals. It would be difficult to think of any aspect of Eastern life mentioned in the Bible which is not included in one or more of the some eleven hundred up-to-date articles in this book.

The author of this *Dictionary* is W. Corswant, late Professor of the History of Religions and of Biblical Archaeology in the Faculty of Theology at Neuchâtel. At the time of his death in 1954 he left a manuscript of some seven hundred and fifty articles. His friend M. Edouard Urech edited, completed, and illustrated the text and saw it through the press. Issued originally in French in 1954 it has been translated into English by Arthur Heathcote. André Parrot, Chief Curator of the Louvre, has written the Foreword.

The articles are arranged in alphabetic order thus making the desired information readily available. To make a wider range of subject matter accessible a topical classification of articles is provided, while the relevant passages in the Bible are listed at the end of each article, in the form of a concordance. Thus the Bible itself becomes a living context of the terms, while the text of the dictionary illuminates the Biblical passages. The numerous line drawings provide splendid illustrations and reconstructions of artifacts. The Oxford University Press is to be congratulated upon providing such an attractive and readable format. The book will become a valued addition to personal as well as church-school and other libraries.

HOWARD T. KUIST

A Protestant Speaks his Mind, by Ilion T. Jones. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa., 1960. Pp. 237. $3.95.

This book was written by Dr. Ilion T. Jones, formerly Professor of Practical Theology at San Francisco Theological Seminary, out of his deep concern about the growing Roman Catholic-Protestant tension in present-day America. The main reason for this increasing tension, he would contend, has been the growing power and influence of Roman Catholicism, which is not only the largest religious group in the United States, but is also the most aggressive in seeking political and financial advantage for itself. So Dr. Jones wrote this book with the following purposes in mind: "to acquaint the average Protestant reader, ministerial and lay, with the nature of the issues between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism; to identify, clarify, and evaluate these issues; to submit information that is essential to the proper under-

standing and a well-rounded discussion of the subject; to stimulate the reader to further study and refer him to source material for that purpose; and to offer some suggestions as to the possible contributions Protestants can make to peaceable living together in our free American society" (p. 8).

Dr. Jones begins by referring to the so-called Irenic Movement, pointing out the growing tendency among Protestant writers today to be more kindly in their references to Roman Catholicism, by playing down the differences between Roman Catholics and Protestants, doubtless in the hope that thereby they will contribute to the praiseworthy cause of reunion among the sundered churches of Christendom. Roman Catholic writers and scholars like Karl Adam, W. H. Van de Pol, and George H. Tanard, are also interested in promoting a *rapprochement* with Protestantism—but only and always, as Dr. Jones rightly says, on Rome's terms. Dr. Jones seeks to get to the root of the difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism by going back to the New Testament, whose Christianity he regards as normative. He describes New Testament Christianity as marked by a clear-cut faith in Jesus Christ as the only Lord and Saviour, a simple form of worship, a democratic pattern of church government, and a ministry which knew no distinction between clergy and laity. Within the three centuries or so which followed the close of the Apostolic Age, however, the Christian religion took on a more sacerdotal and hierarchical form, which paved the way for the full-blown Roman Catholicism of the later Middle Ages, with the pope as its autocratic head. The author next summarizes what he calls "some essential Protestant doctrines" —specifically, the authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures; the accessibility, sovereignty, and freedom of God; the spiritual worship of God; salvation by faith alone; and the responsible person—in such fashion as to point up their sharp and irreconcilable contrast with comparable Roman Catholic positions. Coming to the United States proper, Dr. Jones expounds its doctrine of the separation of Church and State, and declares that, judged by its authoritative pronouncements, Rome does not accept this doctrine; and he goes on to point out that during the past two decades or so, Roman Catholics have sought to breach the "wall of separation" by advocating federal aid to their parochial schools and the appointment of a United States ambassador to the Vatican. On the question of Roman Catholic office holders in the United States, Dr. Jones argues that in view of their Church's officially stated position that Church loyalty must take precedence over political allegiance, such incumbents must be under great pressure to put their Catholicism above their oath of office in case of any conflict between the two. He therefore suggests that all Roman Catholic candidates for public office, from the Presidency downwards, should be asked to give proper assurances on this important matter. Finally, Dr. Jones outlines "some proposals for Protestant action"—these being that Protestants should end their complacency and wake up to the realities of the present situation, should engage in public debate concerning their basic Protestant beliefs, should enter the political arena in order to preserve their free American heritage against an attempted erosion by Roman Catholicism, and should recover their sense of pride in being Protestants.

Within the past year or so, doubtless spurred on by the attempt of a Roman Catholic to be nominated for the Presidency of the United States, quite a number of books have been published dealing with the Roman Catholic problem in latter-day America. This book by Dr. Jones differs from most of the others in setting the issues in the larger perspective of history and of theological principle. Since he is careful to employ official Roman Catholic sources as the basis of his contentions, and since he is scrupulously fair in his evaluations, he has made a significant contribution to public enlightenment on one of the most crucial problems that American democracy has to face today.

NORMAN V. HOPE

The Scottish Reformation, by Gordon Donaldson. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1960. Pp. 242. $5.50.

In this book—based on the Birkbeck Lectures delivered at Cambridge University in 1957-58—Dr. Gordon Donaldson, the eminent Reader in Scottish History at the University of Edinburgh, presents his analysis

and interpretation of the Scottish Reformation, particularly in its organizational and financial aspects. He does not deal with theology, since he rightly observes that theology was hardly in dispute among the Scottish reformers, and quotes the late Dr. George D. Henderson to the effect that "theology is marvellously little in evidence in connection with the Scottish Reformation" (p. 76).

Dr. Donaldson agrees with all well-informed contemporary and subsequent commentators, as to the necessity for a reformation in Scotland, since the Roman Catholic Church there had so obviously failed in its task of ministering adequately to the spiritual needs of the Scottish people. For the rest, however, Dr. Donaldson's construction differs markedly from the traditional viewpoint. He points out that from 1555 on, Reformed congregations—"privy kirks"—were being set up in some of the major Scottish cities, till by 1559 "a Reformed Church organization, though still only at congregational level, was remarkably active" (p. 50). In 1560 when Romanism was legally abolished in Scotland, this Protestant organization was given official status and thereafter expanded, with the help of the five Superintendents who were appointed, and three of the pre-Reformation Roman Catholic bishops who were willing to co-operate with the Protestant movement. Ministerial stipends for this Protestant Church were derived, not as the First Book of Discipline had envisaged, from the major part of the ecclesiastical revenues of the pre-Reformation Church, but from the "thirds of benefices" which the ministers shared with the monarchy from 1561 on.

Meantime the outward organization of the pre-Reformation Church, and particularly its financial structure, continued to exist alongside the growing Protestant Church—except, of course, that the authority of the Bishop of Rome was officially abolished, and the thirds of benefices were appropriated for the use of Protestant ministers and the crown. To be sure, some secularization and other alienation of church lands had been going on for several years; and this movement continued after 1560. After the Protestant Church vainly attempted to realize the ideals of the First Book of Discipline in the matter of church property, from 1566-67 on, it attempted, with the support of the government, to amalgamate the two church structures, by utilizing the services of those who enjoyed episcopal revenues, and by endeavoring to make certain that such incumbents would be capable of performing their official ecclesiastical duties. This, for example, was the real significance of the Convention of Leith of 1572, which introduced the so-called "Tulchan" bishops into the Reformed Church of Scotland. This plan enjoyed some success till the mid-1580's, when the emergence of an ultra-Presbyterian movement, headed by Andrew Melville, opposed and undermined it.

This fresh and novel construction of Dr. Donaldson means, for one thing, that the year 1560, the conventional date of the Scottish Reformation, "is not very significant, and must have been much less definitive in the eyes of contemporaries than it has come to be in the textbooks" (p. 74). Again, it means that the Scottish Protestant Church of John Knox was not Presbyterian in government: "If it must be explained at all in later terminology, it might best be described as congregationalism tempered by episcopacy and Erastianism" (p. 147). Once more, it means that the Scottish Reformation movement followed the Reformation in England much more closely, at least in respect of organization and relation with the State, than has generally been supposed.

It must be agreed that Dr. Donaldson has presented an ably argued case, based on careful study of the original sources—as far as they survive—and on relevant secondary authorities. All future interpretations of the Scottish Reformation will have to take full account of his position as set forth in this book.

NORMAN V. HOPE

An Introduction to the Science of Missions, by J. H. Bavinck (translated by David Hugh Freeman). Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1960. Pp. 323. $4.95.

Students of the missionary enterprise are acquainted with Professor Bavinck through his publication in 1948 of his book *The Impact of Christianity on the Non-Christian World*. In the volume under review the author covers a broader field.

The work is in three main parts, the first being a rather lengthy discussion of the theory of Christian Missions including the Biblical basis of missions and the missionary approach and motives, as well as some of the problems in the practice of present day missions.

The third section of the book discusses the History of Missions as well as an attempt to distinguish what the future of the missionary enterprise may be.

Sandwiched in between these two main sections of the volume is a shorter discussion of "Elenctics." By this the author means the phase of missions which has to do with convicting men outside of Christianity of sin or convincing them of their faults. The word "elenctics" is taken from the Greek word used a number of times in the New Testament and usually rendered "to rebuke." What the author is driving at may be summed up as the apologetic phase of missions.

The title of the book seems to be a little misleading, since it is difficult to see how the author has done much to reduce missions to a "science." The volume should be read, however, by those who wish to keep abreast of mission literature. The discussion of theory is more satisfying than the treatment of the history of missions.

Dr. Bavinck has been a missionary in Indonesia and a Professor of Missions in his native Holland and is at present Professor of Practical Theology in the Free University of Amsterdam.

J. Christy Wilson

One World One Mission, by W. Richey Hogg. Friendship Press, New York, 1960. Pp. 164. $2.95.

The theme for Mission Study in the churches during the present year is, "Into all the World Together," so far as the overseas mission of the church is concerned. This volume is the main one for adult study among the many books published each year by the Missionary Education Movement, or Friendship Press, and adopted for study in most of the larger denominations through their Boards and Mission agencies.

The author was for a number of years associated with Kenneth Scott Latourette of Yale and is now associate Professor of World Christianity at Perkins School of Theology in Southern Methodist University.

Each chapter of the book is like an essay on some phase of the Christian mission in the present world, a world in revolution, as we all know, and a world with population increasing at an explosive rate. The book gives an enormous quantity of facts and figures for so short a volume and these figures are the most recent and up-to-date.

For instance, it may surprise many people to know that three million Americans are now employed overseas; again that 58% of the Christian missionaries from America working abroad now are from sects, "Faith Missions," and churches not related to the National Council of Churches. There are many facts and illustrations here which pastors could use to advantage in their sermons. Each minister should be certain that his church has a display of the mission texts each year and he should study them first to be a step ahead of his good women in missionary knowledge and ability to guide his people in the one great task which Christ gave to his church.

J. Christy Wilson

Safe in Bondage, by Robert W. Spike. Friendship Press, New York, 1960. Pp. 165. $2.75.

This is the main book for adults in the study of the National Missions' subject for the year, which is: "Heritage and Horizons in Home Missions." The author is the General Secretary for Program of the Board of Home Missions of the Congregational and Christian Churches. He has had a great deal of experience as a pastor in both rural and urban situations.

The author begins with a look at the matter of social strategy in national missions and goes on to consider the task of the church in both town and country as well as the inner city and "suburbia." This church program must come to grips with the society and culture of the "organization man" and the culture and problems of the young "intellectual" and the teenager who is out of step with society and its problems in such a baffling time as the present.

Every pastor should read this book; he will find a great deal of interest whether his ministry happens to be in a suburban church, a rural parish, or the inner city. Other books on the Friendship Press list for Mission Study this year should be on display in the church bookroom and will no doubt be used by different organizations in the congregation.

J. Christy Wilson

The Pastor's Prayerbook, by Robert N. Rodenmayer. Oxford University Press, New York, 1960. Pp. 319. $5.00.

The title of this compendium suggests its nature and purpose: it is intended for use in the pastoral ministry. It is the fruit of wide reading and careful selection by the professor of pastoral theology at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific, who acknowledges his deep indebtedness to the various liturgical traditions of the Christian Church. From among some eighteen thousand prayers, the editor has selected 641 and has arranged them into twenty-three categories, such as times of day (morning, noon, and night), institutions (church, community, and nation), seasons of the natural and church year, moods of the human soul, etc. Indeed there is scarcely an area of pastoral concern which is not included, and in every case the prayers are of classic quality. This is not a run-o'-the-mill devotional handbook—of which kind there are entirely too many in circulation and about which the cliché "sweetness and light" has indeed a *qualitative* connotation—it is, moreover, a compilation of the very best expressions that holy minds have made when moved by or before the Unseen.

The usefulness of this volume is increased by the inclusion of twenty-one pages of subject indices and its scholarly calibre is identified by the range of the tabulation of its sources. Only one minor error appears in an otherwise first-rate publication: on pages 81-82, two ascriptions are erroneously listed as benedictions.

Donald Macleod

How Can I Know God?, by W. E. Sangster. Abingdon Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1960. Pp. 162. $2.75.

The passing away of W. E. Sangster last year was felt keenly by the Methodist Church in the British Isles, but in many ways it was a loss to the pulpit of the whole English speaking world. His three little volumes on preaching have had wide and favorable circulation among ministers and are being used as helpful texts in classes in homiletics throughout the United States and Canada. To us who have read these books and to the members of the throngs who came to Westminster hall, London, on Sunday evenings to hear Dr. Sangster preach, it is a matter of great satisfaction that a volume of his sermons have been made available. This book has been published in England by the Epworth Press under the title, *Westminster Sermons*, Vol. I, and is to be followed soon by a second volume, *At Fast and Festival.*

Here are seventeen sermons, under the sub-title, *At Morning Worship*, in the British edition, which have captured some of the radiance and persuasiveness of the living preacher. They are for the most part topical and were designed originally to attract the floating population at the center of a great metropolitan area, which apparently Dr. Sangster did with uncommon success. They are not profound or carefully reasoned treatises, but are simple presentations of the message of the New Testament at work in human situations. They are engaging and interesting, chiefly because they dramatize real people who are involved in the moral struggle and who have found the way to the benefits of "transforming grace" (p. 153).

Donald Macleod

The Church on the Urban Frontier, by G. Paul Musselman. The Seabury Press, Greenwich, Conn., 1960. Pp. 136. $3.25.

"This book was written in a hurry. There is urgency in Urbania." With these words, the author begins to set forth in quick flashes and with pungent phrases the insights into the city churches of our time which he gained over a period of seven years as Executive Secretary of the Division of Urban-Industrial Church Work of the National Council of the Episcopal Church.

This book *has* been written in a hurry.

It has no bibliography, no footnotes, it centers its analysis solely upon the Episcopal Church, and one wishes desperately for further elaboration on some projects which are only sketched for the reader. Despite these facts, however, it is a book which every city pastor, every Church executive, and a good number of Seminary professors ought to read. Phrases and sentences fairly leap out at the reader stimulating whole hosts of thoughts about the archaic structure and approach of Protestantism in the face of the urban challenge. Some will not like the author's frankness when, with his refreshing pointedness, he indicts much urban mission strategy as "merely a matter of subsidizing failure," or when he affirms that in our increasingly urban civilization "we must give up our essentially rural concept of the parish." Some will raise all kinds of theological questions—and they must be raised—about the author's chapter on "Hidden Persuaders," the Church's use of motivational research. Others may be shocked at his opposition to factory chaplaincies, his depreciation of certain kinds of parish calling, his assertion that almost any city minister "can have twenty-five to fifty people coming for counseling if he will let his availability be known"—but that there are real questions as to whether or not the minister *should* be "available" to everyone.

One would like to see the author do some grappling with various theological issues which are raised by points made in this book. But this work does not pretend to give answers, theological or other. It intends to confront with a challenge, to shatter illusions and complacency, to stimulate thought, and to encourage an adventurous creativity in the life of the urban church and its ministry. All this it does do—the answers must come from "the church on the urban frontier."

CONRAD H. MASSA

New Images of Man, by Peter Selz. The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1959. Pp. 159. $5.00.

This is not a book written by professional theologians; it is a book about the doctrine of contemporary man as seen through the eyes of the modern artist and sculptor. "New Images of Man" was an exhibition of painting and sculpture held at the Museum of Modern Art in New York last year, and this book is the published account in photographs and text of the exhibition and of those whose work was displayed.

The prefatory note by Paul Tillich underscores the theologian's concern with the insights into contemporary man which are reflected in these works. The dehumanization of man in our civilization is vividly portrayed in these creations as, in Tillich's words, "all of them show traces of the battle for the human image they want to rediscover."

This book, as with all publications of the Museum, is an excellent piece of work itself. The plates in both black-and-white and color are superbly done. The text is sufficient to help one to see more, but not overdone so that it keeps one from seeing each work freshly for himself. It was this reviewer's privilege to attend the actual exhibition so that he can testify that this book is second only to such attendance if one must choose between the two. If one can have both seen the works in exhibition and have this volume to reflect upon afterward, his cup is full to overflowing.

Those who may feel that the contemporary art forms have nothing to say to them should get and study this volume. Anyone who does not get a shuddering realization of his mortality from Dubuffet's painting *Childbirth* and Campoli's sculpture *Birth* has lost all sensitivity. A clergyman must be shaken by the screaming anti-clericalism in Bacon's oil interpretation of Velasquez' famous *Pope Innocent X*. A human being with any residue of dignity will be amused and yet profoundly disturbed by Westermann's *Memorial to the Idea of Man If He Was an Idea* with its laminated wooden box torso whose front door opens to reveal a mass of garish bottlecaps. For sheer Biblical interpretation, Campoli's *Return of the Prodigal Son* is magnificent sculpture. The grotesque enormous Godhead which seems to swallow the kneeling figure of the returning son makes one want to look away from the multitudinous faces with their bulging eyes. Still as one forces himself to study that head, he begins to feel that he is looking into Creation itself, a Creation which redeems and welcomes back its own, which is both judgment and mercy,

and in whose very grotesqueness there is a basic beneficence.

A book such as this one is disturbing in that it refuses to accept any of the conventional pretensions of human life. In so refusing, it challenges the preacher and theologian to be true to his task which is partly, after all, to cut through those same pretensions to show man what he really is.

CONRAD H. MASSA

Language and Religious Language: A Study in the Dynamics of Translation, by Jules Laurence Moreau. Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1961. Pp. 207. $4.50.

The current interest in and emphasis on the problem of communication as it relates to the Christian Church has given rise to a new series, "The Westminster Studies in Christian Communication," under the general editorship of Kendig B. Cully. This first book of the series assumes the formidable task of serving as one of two foundational volumes which will undergird the series. It should serve this purpose well.

In our more reflective moments we realize that the problem of effective communication in the Church is more than catchy illustrations and stimulating talks. It involves an understanding of the whole gamut of human experience and existence. The broadness of this problem is startingly brought out by the author as he, with a comprehensiveness which is almost encyclopedic, draws upon psychological and sociological insights, linguistic science, Biblical theology, the history of doctrine, and the contemporary church situation. The author is at home in many disciplines and from this broadness is suggestive of vistas which must be dealt with in the matter of apologetics or the Church's task of communication.

The author maintains that language is an historical phenomenon and can only be understood in its social and historical context. Theology, then, is an historical, and not an empirical science, and the basic historical and semantic *milieu* from which the Christian faith arose, is Semitic. This is obviously true in the case of the Old Testament, but the New Testament too, while written in a Hellenistic environment, was couched in a semantic structure which was almost exclusively Semitic and mythic. Dr. Moreau, whose field is New Testament language and literature, is perhaps at his best in his discussion of the mythic stance of the Old Testament and of the Christian Gospel. He maintains that a basic knowledge of Semitic life and literature is necessary before "translation" to the contemporary scene can take place. Exegesis must precede translation, and in the circumstances where a literary translation is desired, this translation will be in paraphrase rather than in attempted word for word equivalents.

Historically, Christianity found it necessary to express itself in the semantic and tongue of the world in which it wished to speak. The New Testament was immediately available in Greek. The genius of Thomism was that it had the foresight and good sense to seize and use emergent Aristotelianism which was then suffocating Neo-Platonism. The same sort of "translation" must be forthcoming today.

Thus, Moreau gives new meaning to the old saw that we must know (1) what it is we are communicating and (2) the situation to which we communicate it. The first involves an immersion within the Semitic matrix which nurtured Christianity. The second involves an immersion in the cross-currents of contemporary thought. Current interpretations such as logical empiricism, and the philosophy of existence are examined. To these popular fields he adds a third, that of modern linguistic science, especially as expounded by Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913). This consideration of syntactics, semantics, lexicology, and phonology will be unfamiliar, though intriguing reading which may make Churchmen uneasy in the realization of their own specialized "functional vocabulary" which bears all the marks of the Hellenistic accoutrements of the centuries. In this context the author distinguishes between religious language as the language of prayer or the vehicle of commitment, and theological language as the instrument of propositional affirmation used for imparting information. The fact that it is the latter which is the author's primary concern gives rise to a question concerning the aptness of the title of the book.

The material with which the book deals is

not new. What is valuable about this book is the attempt to correlate these various and diverse disciplines for the purpose of clarifying the communication task of the Church. The author acknowledges similarities with Bultmann whose central thesis he finds to be more profound than popularly understood (demythologizing Bultmann?) and with Tillich whose polar structure of the theological task he accepts. Yet, both Bultmann and Tillich retain vestiges of Hellenism which subordinates creativity to ontology and eschatology. The Semitic structure depicts a God who acts rather than posits a God who is. This creative, dynamic God, known in the normative Biblical witness, is expressed most clearly in terms of process philosophy, which, as yet, lack systematic treatment as "process theology." The author goes a good way toward the outlining of such a theology.

This book is not trivial. With depth and insight it outlines areas of concern in communication. It speaks to the preacher and teacher. It has relevance for ecumenical mission and communion. It is seminal for the structuring of a theological curriculum. It is a difficult book, mainly because it utilizes specific functional vocabularies with numerous specialized and technical words and phrases. It does not attempt to devise a "metalanguage" to bind together the varying disciplines. While this is desirable, "the most effective work will be accomplished by those who attempt to interpret the idiom of one structure to those oriented toward another. This is the less glorious path, but it is the more relevant one at the moment."

The book serves as a relevant contribution to the task of translation which is the task of every Christian communicator.

ARLO D. DUBA

A Bibliography of Bible Study

(Second, enlarged edition)

by

The Biblical Department of Princeton Theological Seminary

"This bibliography is meant to be representative of the best in Biblical scholarship. Thus important older works will be found side by side with modern ones, and the selections were determined by the intrinsic qualities of the books irrespective of their theological position."—The Preface.

Nearly 1,400 classified titles

Pp. 107 $1.05 postpaid

The Theological Book Agency

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey

Theology Today

Jas. I. McCord, *Chairman, Editorial Committee*
John A. Mackay, *Honorary Chairman*
Hugh T. Kerr, *Editor*

Volume XVII Number 4

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY, 1961

Editorial:

New Occasions Teach New Duties ..... *Hugh T. Kerr*

Where Do We Go From Here? ..... *J. F. Armstrong*

Space Travel and Space Theology ..... *W. Burnet Easton, Jr.*

Tradition as a Protestant Problem ..... *Robert McAfee Brown*

Race, Equality, and Religion ..... *Edward A. Tiryakian*

Theological Studies in College and Seminary ..... *Paul Ramsey*

Christian Education and Theological Method ..... *Gordon E. Jackson*

Symbols: Old and New ..... *Gilbert Cope*

The Nuclear Dilemma, with a Nod to Kierkegaard .... *Robert McFadden*

Theological Table-Talk ..... *George S. Hendry*

The Church in the World ..... *E. G. Homrighausen*

Book Reviews

Published quarterly by: Theology Today, P.O. Box 29, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A. Subscription rates: United States, Canada, and Mexico, $3.00 per year, $5.00 for 2 years; the British Empire except Canada 15/- per year (British agent: B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., Oxford, England); all other countries, $3.50 per year in U.S. funds, $6.00 for 2 years; student rate, $2.00 per year.

Further Publications by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1960

THE PRESBYTERIAN WAY OF LIFE

JOHN A. MACKAY

Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. **Pp. 238. $3.50**

"The Presbyterian way of thought and life, the postures of its piety, its intellectual framework, and its monumental historical achievements are dealt with in this book by an ardent believer."

—Presbyterian Life

AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY

An Historical Interpretation with Representative Documents
Volume I: 1607-1820

H. SHELTON SMITH · ROBERT T. HANDY · LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER

Scribner's, New York **Pp. 615. $10.00**

This work brings together the most significant documents in the field of American Christianity, extending from the earliest colonial beginnings. The documents are carefully organized according to basic periods and dominant cultural trends, each period being prefaced with an extensive orientative and interpretative essay.

THE BIBLICAL VIEW OF SEX AND MARRIAGE

OTTO A. PIPER

Scribner's, New York **Pp. 239. $3.95**

A complete and constructive interpretation of man's sexual nature, and its relation to marriage. Dr. Piper discusses marriage in its varied aspects and the way by which Christian faith is able to render the relationship meaningful.

INDEX TO PERIODICAL LITERATURE ON THE APOSTLE PAUL

(Volume I of New Testament Tools and Studies)

BRUCE M. METZGER

Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich. **Pp. xvi + 183. $4.00**

"This index grew out of an exercise in bibliographical research engaged in by twenty of Dr. Metzger's students in a seminar on Paul. Listing 114 periodical titles and indexing articles in fourteen languages, this bibliography covers the time from the first year of publication of each periodical until the end of 1957. . . . It is difficult to praise sufficiently the excellence of this New Testament tool prepared under the direction of a renowned bibliographer."

—Theological Studies